DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 782 RC 003 166

TITLE	Proceedings of the Conference of the American Country Life Association, Inc. (42nd, Raleigh, North Carolina, July 9-10, 1963). Our Concern for the Disadvantaged in Town and Country Society.
INSTITUTION	American Country Life Association, Washington, D.C.id
PUB DATE	10 Jul 63
NOTE	80p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; American Indians; Church Programs; *Economically Disadvantaged; Education; Higher Education; Migrants; *Minority Groups; Negroes; *Rural Development; Rural Extension; *Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS	Appalachians

ABSTRACT

The future of the disadvantaged is discussed in these proceedings of a 1963 conference of the American Country Life Association. Papers presented at 3 panel discussions give detailed information on the disadvantaged. The panel discussion on the types of disadvantaged people covered American Indians, Appalachian whites, migrants, and Negroes. The 2nd panel discussion covered areas of rural development, agricultural extension service, and private groups. The discussion on how institutions and agencies meet their responsibilities included information on schools, churches, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and higher education. Also included in this report were citations; minutes of the 1963 annual meeting and Board of Directors meetings in 1962 and 1963; a report on proceedings; and a membership list for 1963. (PS)

ED 071782

OUR CONCERN
for the
DISADVANTAGED
in
TOWN AND COUNTRY SOCIETY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Proceedings of the Forty-Second Conference

of the

American Country Life Association, Inc.

North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina

July 9-10, 1963

ED 003199

ED 071782

OUR CONCERN

for the

DISADVANTAGED

in

TOWN AND COUNTRY SOCIETY

Proceedings of the Forty-Second Conference

of the

American Country Life Association, Inc.

North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina

July 9-10, 1963

Printed by Miracle Printing Company
Berlin, Wisconsin
for the
American Country Life Association, Inc.

In Appreciation

The American Country Life Association, Inc., expresses its appreciation to the Sears Roebuck Foundation, long time friend of the Association, whose contribution to the Association helps make possible the printing and wide distribution of the Proceedings.

— INDEX —

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, 1963-64 4

"THE FUTURE OF THE DISADVANTAGED" — Robert T. Frerichs 5

"THE DISADVANTAGED: WHO AND WHERE?" — Howard W. Hjort 11

"THE DISADVANTAGED IN SOCIETY" — C. E. Bishop 19

"THE DISADVANTAGED: WHAT OF THE FUTURE?" — John A. Baker 23

PANEL DISCUSSION — TYPES OF DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE:

"THE AMERICAN INDIAN" — Frell M. Owl 31

"THE APPALACHIAN WHITES" — Milton Ogle 33

"MIGRANTS" — Rev. James L. Vizzard 36

"THE NEGRO" — B. D. Mayberry 37

PANEL DISCUSSION — WHAT IS BEING DONE:

"RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT" — Wesley Lynch 41

"AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE" — R. E. Jones 42

PRIVATE GROUPS" — Rev. James L. Vizzard 43

PANEL DISCUSSION — HOW INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES MEET THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES:

"SCHOOLS" — Miss Lois M. Clark 46

"THE CHURCH" — Rev. E. W. Mueller 48

"GIRL SCOUTS" — Miss Nancy Campbell 51

"BOY SCOUTS" — Edgar W. Wolfe 53

"HIGHER EDUCATION" — Roy C. Buck 55

CITATIONS: Allan B. Kline, Robert W. Mullen ..... 57 - 59

MINUTES: Annual Meeting of 1963 61

MINUTES: Board of Directors, November 26, 1962 68

MINUTES: Board of Directors, July 8 - 9, 1963 73

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS 76

MEMBERSHIP — 1963 77

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS
1963 - 1964

(Date indicates when term expires.)

*PRESIDENT — Rev. Robert T. Frerichs (1965), American Baptist Convention, Rural Church Center, Green Lake, Wis.

*VICE PRESIDENT — W. J. Tudor (1965), Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.

*SECRETARY-TREASURER — Rev. E. W. Mueller (1965), National Lutheran Council, 327 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. W. Aiton (1966), Cooperative Extension Service, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Phillip F. Aylesworth (1964), Federal Extension Service, Washington, D.C.

J. Carroll Bottum (1964), Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mrs. Kendall Bryan (1966), Girl Scouts of USA, 830 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Harry L. Bryson (1964), Agricultural Hall of Fame, 916 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.

Roy C. Buck (1965), Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

*Rev. Hugh P. Cassidy (1964), National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Franklin, Ill.

Miss Lois M. Clark (1965), National Education Association, 1201 16th Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Roger Fleming (1966), American Farm Bureau Federation, 425 13th Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Arthur Floyd, Sr. (1966), Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Glenn S. Fox (1964), Farmers Union Cooperative Marketing Assn., 740 Board of Trade Building, Kansas City, Mo.

*Aubrey D. Gates (1964), American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

R. J. Hildreth (1966), Farm Foundation, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Serge F. Hummon (1966), United Church of Christ, 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Miss Gertrude Humphreys (1966), Cooperative Extension Service, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Jack Jackson (1966), The National Grange, 1616 H Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

*Paul C. Johnson (1965), The Prairie Farmer, 1230 Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

J. Kenneth Stern (1966), American Institute of Cooperation, 1616 H Street Northwest, Washington, D.C.

*Milo K. Swanton (1965), Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Co-operative, 111 South Fairchild Street, Madison, Wis.

Jerry Voorhis (1966), Cooperative League of the USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Wileden (1964), University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Edgar W. Wolfe (1964), Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J.

*Executive Committee

THE FUTURE OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Presidential Address by

THE REV. ROBERT T. FRERICHS, Dean
Rural Church Center
Green Lake, Wisconsin

One of the most popular fads of the day is to view with apprehension the rapid rise in technology in the intricacy and complexity of every walk of life, and the increase in the demands for specialization in every field. Viewers with alarm are having a field day, seeing the world come to that point where efficiency and skill are going to make much of the world's population unneeded and unwanted. The suggestion is being made that soon a comparatively few people with highly sophisticated machinery and computers will be able to supply the needs of everyone, that soon an overworked management class will so direct and control the productive processes that the masses will be the leisure class, their labors unneeded.

The forecasters of this coming day have been at work for many decades. Prophecies of man's upward and onward march toward the ultimate efficient utilization of the resources, which a bounteous nature provides, have been made generations ago. So many of these prophecies have come true that it is regarded as foolhardy to question that mankind still stands on that threshold of unimaginably abundant future. The harnessing of atomic energy just a few years ago has given these hopes a new impetus, and has given new heart to the optimist.

A new dimension to abundance, which largely eliminates the drudgery, the backbreaking work, the inefficient use of muscle power, has been long in coming. But it is nearer now than we really like to think and forces us to examine the nature of our goals. When man's needs for food, shelter, comfort, health and security are largely met, a basic set of challenges has been met. What remains?

You may have been wondering why I, as a clergyman, have not by this time introduced a Scriptural text for my address. The reason is that I belong to that school of modern clergymen who like to get their hearers a little bit off balance by delaying the introduction of the text for a few minutes, and then by putting it in unexpectedly. Here is the text: "I am come," said Jesus, "That they may have life, and have it abundantly." (John 10:10). This is one of those cryptic texts which have been variously interpreted; but its context, in the contrast between the good shepherd and the evil thief, makes rather clear the principal application of its meaning in terms of man's total welfare.

This text represents not only the revelation of a good God in respect to His purposes in His dealing with His children, but also the aspiration of the human spirit for abundance and an end to poverty. The Greek word used here, "perissos," means literally "beyond the common," and this is the gift which is offered by God to His creation, mankind. It is, therefore, the conviction of the Christian faith that life is intended to be better than common, to be abundant for all people.

Out of this conviction comes the traditional and theologically sound insistence of the Christian community that comparative poverty, disadvantage, discrimination, and the lack of means for the good life cannot forever be

tolerated. People are entitled, not to just mere survival, but to the "better than common" life. This is the verdict of the Christian tradition, based upon its Founder's words. Hence, that tradition has constantly stood in the way of the possession of an excessive abundance by some, as over against the excessive lack of goods and amenities by others. The basis for this, referring back to the Gospel record, lies in the understanding that man is important, not because he has something to contribute to his fellowmen but because he is beloved as one of them. To use a familiar figure, one cannot view man as detachable from other men any more than one can view his arm as detachable from his body.

Not only the Christian tradition, but the great liberal and humanist philosophies of the 17th century affirmed the equality of all men, particularly in respect to opportunity, to personal worth, and to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our American values particularly have been centered around —

1. the dignity and importance of the individual person;
2. freedom of thought and action of the individual person;
3. freedom for the development of the abilities of the person;
4. regard for the group and cooperation within it for the achieving of persons' goals;
5. regard for the family as the basic social institution;
6. regard for productive work whereby the individual person contributes both to his own and society's good;
7. concern for the physical and mental health of the community;
8. regard for voluntary public service by private individuals;
9. acceptance of change as a normal aspect of social life, and regard for development of continually more helpful forms of social, economic as well as personal processes.

(Ralph H. Gabriel: Traditional Values in American Life-UNESCO)

Thus, out of the Christian and humanist understandings of the nature of man in his relationships arose our system of government, with its persistent insistence on the rights of the person, the integrity of the individual, and the desirability of an equitable and prosperous society in which human dignity and personality, as well as cooperation and social organization, could develop to their most complete possibility.

But in the America of today, as in its earlier days, disadvantaged people have continually challenged the integrity of our goals, the purity of our motives and especially the imaginativeness of our personal and social techniques by which we attempt to reach our goals. The disadvantaged person — and often because ours is a mass society, the disadvantaged group — exists in a state of inferiority or unfavorable contrast in comparison with the achievement and accomplishment of the majority. The disadvantaged are without precisely those opportunities, those goods, those values which our religious and social convictions insist that they should have.

In the sessions of this annual meeting, the character and dimensions of the American problem of the disadvantaged will be studied in a number of different areas. It is our hope that valuable insights into the problem will precede the emergence of effective and early solutions to many of these problems. But underlying all of our discussion will be a process of analysis which is based upon the assumptions which we have brought to this meeting.

We will need to analyze the character of chronic and persistent disadvantage. In general, we will find that this has not greatly changed since, in 1938, this Association met in Lexington to discuss "Disadvantaged People in Rural Life." In his presidential address, Dr. Dwight Sanderson called attention to some of the major causes of the existence of disadvantaged people — overpopulation, lack of education, poor health, poverty, absentee ownership. Economic, cultural, physical, mental and social causes contribute to the exclusion of many in our society from the advantages of the more favored of our citizens. The character of these factors which stand in the way of the American dream needs to be carefully described in our sessions.

One needs, however, to go behind the obvious characteristics of the sources of disadvantage, and to seek to discover the causes of these illnesses which cripple so many people's chances and hopes. In the study by the Conference on Economic Progress entitled "Poverty and Deprivation in the U.S. — the Plight of Two-fifths of a Nation," it is suggested that since before the Great Depression this nation has made almost no progress in altering the proportion of the poverty-stricken to the rest of our nation. It almost appears that, although our technical knowledge of the nature of this social illness has progressed, the motivation to change and heal has not been developed enough to make change upward a possibility.

A lack of acceptance of the values of equality of opportunity is most certainly one of the underlying causes of the continuation of disadvantage. This is demonstrated in the massive resistance to racial, cultural and ethnic integration in our society. It is illustrated in the tacit acceptance of the idea that a certain and a growing proportion of our population will always be on relief, and that one of the inevitable costs of growing automation and efficiency is the care, through governmental welfare programs, of the increasing number of unneeded and unwanted, unemployed and unemployable people in the society. In public schools, youth programs, cultural services, and even in religious societies, one finds that the disadvantaged are receiving a disproportionately small amount of attention. One has the feeling that in our American society, with its dream of equality, we have stopped short of the dream to accept a permanent division, perhaps on a two-to-one basis, of "more equal" and "less equal" individuals.

Far more noticeable, however, in our society than this tacit acceptance of a dream which is far short of our great dream, is the existence of real opposition to the idea of equality. In the thirties, Harry Overstreet wrote a book called, "We Move in New Directions," in which he pointed out that in America we had a number of revolutions looking toward our great dream, and that all of them levelled off before they reached their goals. As the new nation late in the 18th century made its compromises with the Tory minority, so each new revolution made its compromises with its enemies — and this is so typical a social process that we tend to ignore it. But there are, despite our many social gains, still many people who believe in monarchy, unrestrained power, monopoly, slavery, ignorance and exploitation. To close our eyes to the existence of these evils is to render ourselves ineffective in the effort to realize our dream.

The myths of an earlier social order still stand in our way of progress toward a better order — and these myths are so widely held that a modern citizenry and its representation in the state and national legislatures can positively plan for the continuation of the inequalities against which we struggle. Equal access to education, to credit, to housing, to training for and membership in trades and professions are denied not only because we do

not yet fully accept equality as an achievable ideal, but also because many often deliberately and knowingly oppose this ideal.

But beyond these retardants to the kind of equality for which Americans dreamed, lies a third factor which is the despair of every leader in the battle against disadvantage. This is the psychological and sociological inertia which is characteristic of most persons and social institutions. We do not like to change. Things are all right as they are — at least they are enough "all right" that it would be hazardous to try to change them. The fear of alienation from our fellowmen, our lack of confidence and assurance, our satisfaction with what security we have as over against the chances we take when we risk change, are sufficient usually to deter us from actively seeking change. It is here that the demonstrations for equal rights, the rebellions against school boards, the use of aggressive collective action in the market place, and the division of religious groups form a reasonable approach to the existence of disadvantage and discrimination. They are, socially, simply the attempts to stir society out of its inertia and lethargy into progressive and vigorous striving for its real goals.

After we have analyzed our problem in terms of its underlying causes and of the expressions which it takes in the social, educational, economic and religious areas of our common life, we need to take into consideration the assumptions upon which we might attempt the approach to the total problem of disadvantage. Let us, in good homiletical style, examine three of these assumptions.

One is the assumption which arises out of ancient society, out of the Judeao-Christian tradition, and, some say, also out of 17th century Protestantism: the assumption that each should work to carry his own load and beyond that to contribute to the general good. In a world of the future, when a third or a half of the population is not needed in the productive or distributive processes, are we wise in holding this assumption? We had better start making up our minds about that now when our relief loads and our employment percentages are still low. If man is to be valued only because of what he can produce or contribute, then this value needs to be actively sought in the construction of our coming automated society and in the new day of mass leisure, mass unemployment and relief. I find it almost impossible to consider a time when we would generally value a man highly when his mind, his muscle, his services were not at all needed, even to keep him alive and occupied. Yet in the development of the changes which are constantly ours to make in our organizations, governments, institutions and personal customs, this assumption must be understood and in all probability modified if a humane future is to come.

A second assumption, which has always been popular in the Country Life movement but not necessarily in the total national scene, is that we not only do but should exist in a corporate society. We have struggled against this assumption, and in our modern society there are powerful groups which still argue for individualism in the frontier sense. But we by a great majority refuse today to put our trust in individualism as over against cooperative or corporate means of ordering our lives. It is not a plot of a few, but the desire of many, that social institutions are being asked to provide for our safety, our health, our education, our jobs, our security in old age, and especially for our protection in our attempts to do as we please in our spare time.

The cooperative way, in which the individual bears real responsibility for

the common decision, is still a powerful force both in rural and urban society. But it still competes with the corporate idea, in which the individual delegates his authority and reduces his responsibility. And in many areas of the world, the collective principle is popular and strong.

This assumption, then, that we must live in what, for a better word, we call a corporate or cooperative or collective society — in a society where the individual **must** work with and associate responsibly with others — is an assumption requiring definition and clarification.

A third assumption is one that gives this Association real concern when it meets to discuss the problems of country life. It is related to that condition of inertia and despair about which we talked before. It is the assumption that nonparticipation is generally bad. Historically we have always assumed this when we have talked about alleviating the disadvantage which people experience in our society. "Get them in school," we say. "Get them in a cooperative," "Get them to work together — or work with others." But probably a majority of the disadvantaged live their lives in nonparticipation. They are not in clubs and associations; they do not participate in church; they do not seek leadership; they often fail to vote; they do not seek to make their voices heard.

A society that is moving rapidly toward higher efficiency and greater economy and more leisure may be seriously tempted to encourage rather than discourage nonparticipation. If we intend to make a man unnecessary in our society, we would not be about to encourage him to discuss this fate with us. But if we intend a society which respects and values individuals, we take an opposite course. Despite all its critics, the Christian missionary enterprise has much to teach us at this point. From whatever motive, we deliberately went out to develop participation **with** us in achieving the good and abundant life for all. We often went into societies and cultures to change them, and to change them in the direction of more participation, more responsibility for others, more interdependence.

The studies in Appalachia, as well as the studies in rural slums and in areas of economic and cultural stagnation (as well as, for that matter, in the corresponding urban situations), point us over and over again to the need of enlisting the people in these areas in the process of achieving their own, as well as our, salvation in participative ways. We might well say that this assumption, negatively stated above, might be positively stated in terms of arriving at the end of disadvantage through the processes of democratic participation and mutual endeavor.

Disadvantage can be attacked on many fronts, but its amelioration is of concern to all in our nation. Were we to see, as some do, the coming of a day when a third or more of our income in the productive segment of society will go to the support of a vast unneeded segment of our society which does not and does not need to produce, we would rightly be concerned. And this concern calls for the sharing of efforts and the mutual support of valid goals.

In a specialized society, it is a temptation for a school board to see its task narrowly, perhaps even as the caretaker of buildings and the employer of specialists in education. It is a temptation shared by the church, whose trustees often care more for the maintenance of the building than for the propagation of the Gospel. It is a temptation for the farm organization to

see its major goals as economic simply because its current major problems seem to be economic. And likewise for many associations and organizations, the narrow view is a natural one.

But we know that the value-systems of the Christian person and his church are relevant to the value-systems of the rural educator, the directors of co-operatives, the members of farm organizations, the officials of government, and the shapers of ideas in papers, magazines and other communication media. And the value-systems of all these are of equal relevance to the churchman or to the citizen.

We are in this together — this struggle for the achievement of the values that will make human life a more abundant life, that will make every person's life "better than common." It may be that our major need is to seek always, in consultation and common effort, to share and unify our knowledge, our faith and our strength, in order that the entire order may gain, and that the entire society may find its abundance together.

In this Association, we have long since learned that our problems are common problems, and that when we talk of one group's difficulties, we find we are talking of our common difficulties. Knowing that the educator, the churchman, the capitalist, the worker, are all together in the total society, we see the effort to eliminate disadvantage as a common effort.

While advice, counsel, love, concern, patient leadership, education, credit, social organization can all contribute to the elimination of the human loss arising out of disadvantage, it is also true that these without institutional cooperation, unified action, and a common set of values and goals, will fail to accomplish the task. If personal individualism is outdated, so is the individualism of social institutions. It is, therefore, well for us to be together when we study the disadvantaged in country life, because we will be together later on as we seek to reduce and finally eliminate this massive barrier to the abundant life.

THE DISADVANTAGED: WHO AND WHERE

HOWARD W. HJORT
Research Agricultural Economist, Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Your President earlier referred to disadvantaged people as those "who lacked substantially the economic strength, security, education and circumstances which prevented their sharing in the American dream and the abundance of American life." My task in this paper is to try to identify and quantify this subgroup of our society that we here term the disadvantaged. Geographic areas where disadvantaged people are concentrated will also be considered.

The procedure is to use an income measure to delineate a subgroup that we believe contains most of the disadvantaged. Selected characteristics of this subgroup will be compared with those of another subgroup that we feel contains relatively few disadvantaged persons. Observed differences between the groups will provide a basis for some speculation about who the disadvantaged are.

We will then turn to the question where the disadvantaged.

The basic assumption underlying what follows is that the disadvantaged group is a low income group. We assume disadvantaged persons are either without income or have relatively low incomes. But we are not assuming that all low income people are disadvantaged.

The income level used is $2,000 — we specifically assume that the disadvantaged are to be found among those persons who in 1960 reported a 1959 money income of less than $2,000. And at the same time, we are assuming the group of persons that received an income of $2,000 or more does not include a significant number of disadvantaged persons.

The selection of this income level is somewhat arbitrary. The data source relied upon, the 1960 Census of Population, would permit alternative levels. The $2,000 level may be low. For example, this excludes a person earning a dollar an hour for a normal year's work.

Income reported in the Census of Population is money income — not real income. The value of income "in kind," such as free living quarters or food or food produced and consumed in the home is not included. Included are all monies received from both work and non-work sources. Wages and salaries, tips, commissions, cash bonuses and net money income from an individually owned enterprise are examples of income from work sources. Income from non-work sources includes rent, royalties, interest, dividends, social security benefits, pensions, veterans payments, military allotments for dependents, unemployment insurance, public assistance and alimony payments.

These income figures represent income before deductions. There are some weaknesses associated with the use of these data. There are some indications that income is underreported in the Census — especially for income from non-work sources. This seems reasonable, as the respondents usually rely upon memory when answering the income questions.

The exclusion of "in kind" income biases the results for some groups. The difference between money and real income is quite large for certain groups such as farmers (especially for those renting) and members of the armed forces. For other groups there is little or no difference between these two concepts.

Another caution — these data refer to a single year. As a result, some areas will appear more favorable (others less so) that would be the case if data covering a longer time period were available.

Keeping these considerations in mind, let us now consider the question, who the disadvantaged.

There were 126.3 million persons 14 years old and over in 1960. They can be subdivided into three groups: (1) the 35.8 million without income in 1959; (2) the 36.3 million with income under $2,000; and (3) the 54.2 million reporting an income of $2,000 or more for 1959 (Table 1).

Although we indicated above that the disadvantaged group were to be found among the 72 million without income or with an income of less than $2,000 the evidence suggests very few of the "without income" group could properly be termed disadvantaged.

Nearly 83% of this group are females (Table 1, Line III A). About 70% of the males without income were 14 to 24 years of age while about 9% of the males with an income above $2,000 were in this age category. Less than 5% worked in 1950 and only 2.5% worked full-time. Nearly 92% were not actively seeking employment when the Census was taken.

Housewives and students not seeking employment, persons working but with no reportable income — working in a family business for example — and a majority of the members of institutions are without income.

These considerations strongly suggest few of those without income could properly be termed disadvantaged. There is some disturbing evidence however. For example, 15.8% of the nonwhite male were without income but only 9.4% of the white males (Table 1, Line II A) Also, 3.1% of the males were in the unemployed category in 1960 (Table 1, Line VI A 3).

Next, let us consider the group with less than $2,000 income. Males accounted for 40.7% of those with less than $2,000 income — 22.5% of the white but 37.5% of the nonwhite males were included in this group (Table 1, Line II B).

For whites, the percentage 65 years of age and over was about three times as large as for the group with $2,000 or more income. For nonwhites this percentage was more than four and one-half times that observed for the higher income group.

The young were also disproportionately represented in the less than $2,000 income group, especially for males where 39% of the white males and 27.5% of the nonwhite males were 14-24 years of age compared with 8.7 and 9.5%, respectively, in the $2,000 and over income group. The differences among females were not as great.

An indication of the income disadvantage associated with low educational levels is indicated in Section V of Table 1. Over 20% of the white and about 44% of the nonwhite males over 25 years of age with less than $2,000 income had received less than 5 years of schooling — 69.2 and 79.0% of the white and nonwhite males had not advanced past 8 years of schooling. For those with an income of $2,000 or more 4% of the white males and 16.5% of the nonwhites were equipped with less than 5 years of schooling — 32 and 51.7% with less than 9 years.

Although two-thirds of those with less than $2,000 income worked in 1959 less than 15% worked full-time compared with about 70% of those

TABLE 1 — CHARACTERISTICS OF INCOME GROUPS BY SEX AND RACE

	Total	White Males	Nonwhite Males	White Females	Nonwhite Females
			(thousands)		
I. Persons 14 years old and over	126,276.6	55,036.2	6,279.2	58,086.7	o,874.5
A. Without income in 1959	35,822.0	5,160.9	990.2	26,941.6	2,729.3
B. With less than $2,000 income in 1959	36,287.1	12,395.0	2,355.8	18,394.2	3,142.1
C. With $2,000 or more income in 1959	54,167.5	37,480.3	2,933.2	12,751.0	1,003.0
			(percent)		
II. Persons 14 years and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
A. Percent without income	28.4	9.4	15.8	46.4	39.7
B. Percent with less than $2,000 income	28.7	22.5	37.5	31.7	45.7
C. Percent with $2,000 or more income	42.9	68.1	46.7	21.9	14.6
III. Distribution of persons 14 years old and over	100.0	43.6	5.0	46.0	5.4
A. Distribution of those without income	100.0	14.3	2.8	75.2	7.6
B. Distribution of those with less than $2,000 income	100.0	34.2	6.5	50.7	8.7
C. Distribution of those with $2,000 or more income	100.0	69.2	5.4	23.5	1.9
IV. Age distributions:					
A. Persons without income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
14 - 24	31.8	71.4	68.7	22.5	36.2
25 - 64	60.8	21.1	26.9	69.8	58.5
65 and over	7.4	7.3	4.4	7.7	5.3
B. Persons with less than $2,000 income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
14 - 24	27.6	39.0	27.5	21.5	18.5
25 - 64	46.1	32.9	54.3	50.5	66.0
65 and over	26.3	28.1	18.2	28.0	15.5
C. Persons with $2,000 or more income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
14 - 24	10.0	8.7	9.5	13.9	12.0
25 - 64	82.6	83.7	86.6	78.3	83.2
65 and over	7.4	7.6	4.0	7.8	2.8
V. Years of schooling — persons 25 years old and over only: (Table 223, Line 590)					
A. Without income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

CHARACTERISTICS OF INCOME GROUPS BY SEX AND RACE (continued)

	Total	White Males	Nonwhite Males	White Females	Nonwhite Females
4 years or less	8.0	20.7	35.4	5.8	19.0
3 - 8 years	31.1	42.6	35.5	29.6	38.6
9 - 12 years	48.9	26.6	24.0	51.9	36.9
Over 12 years	12 0	10.1	5.0	12.7	5.5
B. With less than $2,000 income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
4 years or less	16.3	20.6	43.7	9.2	24.9
3 - 8 years	40.9	48.6	35.3	37.6	40.3
9 - 12 years	33.2	22.8	17.5	41.1	30.5
Over 12 years	9.6	8.0	3.5	12.1	4.3
C. With $2,000 or more income	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
4 years or less	4.2	4.0	16.5	2.1	5.9
3 - 8 years	26.4	28.0	35.2	19.4	24.2
9 - 12 years	47.0	45.7	37.2	53.2	46.7
Over 12 years	**22.4**	22.3	11.0	25.3	23.2

VI. Employment characteristics —	Total	Males	Females
A. Persons without income:			
1. Percent worked in 1959	4.5	9.9	3.4
a. Percent worked 50-52 weeks in 1959	2.5	5.6	1.9
2. Percent not in labor force in 1960	91.7	82.6	93.5
3. Percent unemployed in 1960	1.2	3.1	.8
B. Persons with less than $2,000 income:			
1. Percent worked in 1959	66.0	71.6	62.1
a. Percent worked 50-52 weeks in 1959	14.8	20.3	11.1
2. Percent not in labor force in 1960	52.2	42.7	58.8
3. Percent unemployed in 1960	4.4	6.2	3.2
C. Persons with $2,000 or more income:			
1. Percent worked in 1959	95.6	96.8	92.1
a. Percent worked 50-52 weeks in 1959	69.6	72.6	60.7
2. Percent not in labor force in 1960	8.5	6.1	15.7
3. Percent unemployed in 1960	2.7	2.9	2.2

earning more income. Over half of the low income group were not actively seeking work when the Census was taken. The unemployment rate was about twice as large for males in the low income group.

Most of those included in the group with an income less than $2,000 would not normally be considered disadvantaged. Students who are in the labor market during part of the year as well as those in the labor force the entire year on a part-time basis are included. Many of the young in this income category are members of the Armed Forces. And house wives who are in and out of the labor force during the year are included.

But this group also includes 84% of the 14.7 million with income only from non-work sources. The majority of these are elderly. About 5.4 million worked 50 to 52 weeks and were still in this income category. About 3.6 million worked on a part-time basis — some because they could find nothing else. About 1.6 were unemployed, and some of these were very young, not enrolled in school, in the labor force, but not employed.

The unemployment rate for the young not enrolled in school was extremely high as indicated below:

	Years of Age					
	14	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**
White Males	12.0	16.6	19.9	17.9	14.0	11.6
Nonwhite Males	15.2	15.4	18.1	19.7	19.3	16.0
White Females	12.1	16.0	18.1	14.0	8.7	7.5
Nonwhite Females	19.3	23.4	27.5	26.2	21.0	18.3

	Years of Age			
	20	**21 & 22**	**23 & 24**	**25-29**
White Males	10.1	8.4	6.3	4.4
Nonwhite Males	15.2	12.8	11.0	8.8
White Females	7.0	6.0	5.6	5.4
Nonwhite Females	16.0	14.2	11.6	9.8

The above comparisons clearly indicate those with the least amount of schooling are the most seriously disadvantaged — irrespective of age, color or sex. In addition, a high proportion of the elderly are disadvantaged according to the above criteria — irrespective of color or sex. Nonwhites appear to be disadvantaged relative to whites, even after taking into consideration the differences in level of education. And finally, relatively few of the females received more than $2,000 money income.

Where are the disadvantaged? Most of those with less than $2,000 money income were located in urban areas. About 24 million of the 36.3 million in this income group were classified as urban when the Census was taken. Seventy-two percent of the females and 58% of the males in the low income group were located in urban areas.

Although two-thirds of the low income group resided in urban areas it is in the rural areas where, on a relative basis, low income conditions are the most severe. In 49 rural counties over 70% of the males with income received less than $2,000 in 1959. All but one of these counties were in the Census South. In another 204 counties, between 60 and 70% of the males reported an income less than $2,000 — all but 11 were in the South.

In the following table, for the nine geographic divisions of the United States, the percent of the counties falling within each of five income percentage categories are presented. In each county the number of males with an income below $2,000 was divided by the number of males with income. The result was used to subdivide the counties into five groups — ranging from those

where less than 30% of the males with income received less than $2,000 up to the counties where 60% or more of the males reported low incomes.

In about 80% of the counties in the Middle Atlantic division less than 30% of the males received an income below $2,000. At the other extreme, in only 4% of the East South Central counties were males as fortunate.

Alternatively, it was in only 1 to 10% of the counties of the urban oriented Northeast, the rapidly growing far West and the highly industrialized East North Central where more than 40% of the males reporting income received less than $2,000 in 1959. But more than 40 percent of the males with income received less than $2,000 in 59, 64 and 85% of the counties in the three Southern divisions.

As shown on Table III, 64% of those 14 years old or over in the South were either without income or with an income under $2,000 in 1959. In the

TABLE II — Distribution of counties within the geographic divisions of the United States where males with less than $2,000 income as a percent of all males with income was:

Division/1	Less than 30.0	30.0-39.9	40.0-49.9	50.0-59.9	60.0 and over
			Percent		
Middle Atlantic	80.7	18.7	.6	0	0
New England	70.2	26.8	3.0	0	0
Pacific	63.0	30.9	1.8	1.8	2.5
East North Central	53.4	36.2	9.2	1.2	0
Mountain	50.0	39.2	8.7	1.4	.7
West North Central	20.4	41.5	28.4	8.1	1.6
West South Central	16.4	24.2	26.0	23.2	10.2
South Atlantic	14.6	21.1	24.3	26.5	13.5
East South Central	4.1	11.3	23.9	28.3	32.4

1/The divisions consist of the following States: **Middle Atlantic** — New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; **New England** — Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Cannecticut and Rhode Island; **Pacific** — Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California and Hawaii; **East North Central** — Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio; **Mountain** — Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico; **West North Central** — North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa and Missouri; **West South Central** — Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas and Louisiana; **South Atlantic** — West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida; **East South Central** — Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama.

TABLE III — WITHIN REGION COMPARISONS

	Northeast	North Central	South	West
		(percent)		
Persons 14 years old and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	28.0	28.3	30.0	25.8
With income under $2,000	24.7	27.7	33.9	27.4
Males 14 years old and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	9.8	9.1	12.1	8.1
With income under $2,000	18.6	22.4	31.4	22.0
Nonwhite males 14 years and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	14.4	15.4	16.8	13.4
With income under $2,000	22.6	25.9	48.1	26.6
Rural males 14 years old and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	11.6	11.5	15.0	9.9
With income under $2,000	22.1	29.4	40.2	29.0
Females 14 years old and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	44.6	46.5	47.0	43.4
With income under $2,000	30.3	32.7	36.2	32.8
Nonwhite females 14 years old and over	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	37.4	42.4	39.2	41.9
With income under $2,000	35.5	37.8	53.3	34.9
Rural females 14 years old and over ..	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Without income in 1959	49.8	54.8	53.4	51.6
With income under $2,000	31.9	32.2	35.5	34.4

North Central the percentage was 46. And in both the Northeast and West it was 53.

The sharp regional differences for males without income or with a low income is indicated on this table again — 44% in the South, 32 in the North North Central, 30 in the West and 28 in the Northeast. The regional differences are less for females.

The regional variation is greater for rural males than for all males — 55% of the rural males in the South were without income or with a low income, income or with less than $2,000 income. In the North Central the applicable 41% in the North Central, 39% in the West and 34% in the Northeast.

But the differences are most pronounced for nonwhites. Sixty-five percent of the nonwhite males and 93% of the nonwhite females were either without income or with less than $2,000 income. In the North Central the applicable percentages were 41 and 80; in the West 40 and 77; and in the Northeast 37 and 73. The percentages for nonwhite femaes in all but the South are very close to the figure for all females.

In conclusion, on a relative basis the disadvantaged are concentrated in the South. On an absolute basis the disadvantaged are concentrated in urban areas. The disadvantaged appear to be the uneducated, the elderly, the nonwhites and females.

THE DISADVANTAGED IN SOCIETY

C. E. BISHOP, Head,
Department of Agricultural Economics,
North Carolina State of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh

In order to understand why people are disadvantaged we must first identify the disadvantaged and classify them according to their physical, economic, and social characteristics. Mr. Hjort provided us with one definition of the disadvantaged in society and presented a profile of those with less than $2000 income and of their location. This afternoon the panel discussed the problems of particular types of disadvantaged people in our society. These have been comprehensive treatments. My task is to elaborate upon the causes for the disadvantaged individuals and groups in our society.

In an earlier paper which I presented before this Association, I outlined three general types of income problems and policy approaches which appeared to be relevant to each type of problem.[1] The types of problems which were identified included a **poverty** problem (perhaps more properly referred to as an asset problem), a **preference** problem (sometimes referred to as a problem of income valuation and also by sociologists and social psychologists as the problem of anomia), and a **resource adjustment** problem. I should like to begin our discussion with a brief review of these types of problems.

THE POVERTY PROBLEM . . . The existence of poverty implies the ownership of little or no wealth. Some families own so few resources that they are unable to purchase the goods and services generally considered to constitute a socially acceptable minimum level of living, even when their resources are employed in their most productive uses. This situation describes real poverty, the control of too few assets to yield an income high enough to sustain a socially acceptable level of living.

THE PREFERENCE PROBLEM . . . Some families . . . undoubtedly have low money income by choice. They simply are not motivated by money income . . . To the extent that there is a low-income problem among these families, it is a problem in the valuation of income. The problem results from a conflict of interests between low-income families and the rest of society over the manner in which the various components of welfare shall be weighted.

THE RESOURCE ADJUSTMENT PROBLEM . . . A resource adjustment problem exists when incomes of families are low because barriers prevent these families from transferring their resources to higher paying and preferred uses.

Since the focus of this conference is on the disadvantaged in our society, I should like to focus attention primarily upon the poverty problem. The definition provided above is static in nature. Most of our discussion here today also has been static. Certainly the physically and mentally handicapped are disadvantaged. Our concern here, however, is much more inclusive. We are interested in all individuals who own too few resources to earn an income which is sufficient to sustain a minimum level of living or who are unable

[1] C. E. Bishop, "Clarifying the Problems of Low-Income Families," Proceedings of the American Country Life Association, 1956, pp. 6-14.

to find employment for their resources in uses which will provide minimum level of living. We also are concerned with disadvantaged communities and with their relationships to disadvantaged individuals.

Our economy is not static. It is highly dynamic. It is characterized by rapidly changing technology, automation, creation of new occupations destruction of old occupations, obsolescence in skills, changing education and skill requirements for jobs, rapid growth in some communities, and stagnation and degeneration in other communities. Individuals and communities are affected differently by these changes. Individuals may find their skills and investments rendered obsolete. Communities may also be bypassed and may find their social institutions degenerating.

Several years ago T. W. Schultz put forth the hypothesis that poverty in agriculture was largely a result of the manner in which the economy developed.[2] It was his thesis that some communities are favored by economic progress while others are bypassed. The bypassed communities fail to participate in the income growth associated with economic progress. Consequently, incomes in those communities lag behind those of favored communities. Impediments to the free flow of labor and other resources among communities enhance income differentials and differences in community institutions. Consequently, differences in investment in the human agent tend to be cumulative over time. These differences perpetuate and magnify income differences.

As our economy has continued to grow and develop, the pace of technological change has quickened. Moreover, economic activity has come to be much more interdependent and more concentrated in favored areas. Consequently, we now find many communities that not only are bypassed but are actually degenerating.

There was a time when the term "ghost town" was reserved largely for gold mining and silver mining villages, and more recently for coal mining towns. During the past decade the term has acquired relevance in agricultural communities. This is particularly true of supply centers and small villages which have depended heavily upon farm product processing. Modern transportation and communication systems which have developed in conjunction with large changes in structure of modern agriculture have made it possible, and in fact often profitable, to bypass rural towns and villages. As a consequence the current U.S. scene is characterized by many sick communities.

The problems of disadvantaged individuals, therefore, are to a considerable degree problems of sick communities. People in these communities find a decreasing demand for their services. Furthermore, many of them now face a bleak prospect that their services have become largely obsolete. Accordingly, there are many new entrants into the poverty category who find that their assets have been destroyed by the rapid and impersonal march of technological and economic progress. Many people in these communities face the necessity of retraining for other occupations if they are to participate in the nation's economic progress. The alternative for many is to remain in the poverty category and to subsist on various kinds of welfare programs.

I do not wish to overstate my case. Whether a person is disadvantaged at a particular time also may depend upon the level of economic activity at that time. It has become fashionable among economists to argue over whether the current high level of unemployment represents a deficiency in aggregate

[2] T. W. Schultz, Reflections on Poverty in Agriculture," Journal of Political Economy, February, 1950.

with technological change and with other structural changes which have altered the composition of the demand for labor. It is argued that unemployment, therefore, results from the fact that many people do not possess the proper training or ability to fill the jobs which are available, that they are not located where job vacancies are or can be expected to open up, or that they are unwilling or unable to move or to learn of the existence of suitable jobs.[3]

The alternative thesis is that unemployment stems from the lack of sufficient demand for labor to absorb all of those who are seeking work. It is my opinion that the dichotomy is not this clear cut. Certainly it should be recognized that during periods of high unemployment in the economy, the education and skill requirements for particular jobs tend to be upgraded. Accordingly, the requirements for employment in particular occupations may depend upon conditions in the labor market. Whether a person is disadvantaged, or the extent to which he is disadvantaged, therefore, may well depend upon the general level of economic activity and upon general conditions in the labor market.

Impediments to resource development and to labor transfers become stronger during periods of recession and heavy unemployment. This is true of racial barriers, educational levels, and other impediments. Many persons who would be quite employable in a tight labor market find themselves disadvantaged in a labor market characterized by high unemployment. Undoubtedly, this is an important factor among the disadvantaged in urban areas at the present time.

Even so it has become obvious that there are differential rates of growth in the demand for labor in various occupations and that there is a premium upon acquiring the training and skills needed for employment in the rapidly growing occupations. Furthermore, even today when there are rather large numbers of unemployed in the economy there are many jobs which are unfilled because of a shortage of people with relevant training and skills.

Why has this situation developed? Why are we witnessing an increase in the number of disadvantaged in society while at the same time we are experiencing a shortage of highly trained and skilled people for many occupations?

Clearly, we have failed to anticipate the structural changes which are taking place in our economy and to prepare people for emerging jobs. Our educational systems have failed to make people aware of the nature and extent of the changes which are taking place and which will come to pass in our economy. Our institutions at the local, state, and national levels must share the responsibility for this failure. Labor market institutions also must share this guilt. The labor market does not and has not disseminated pertinent information to people.

As individuals, it is difficult, if not impossible, effectively to anticipate changes of the nature which have occurred in the labor market and which continue to occur. Frequently, the individual gets the signals only after the changes are an accomplished fact. Our occupational guidance systems have failed to disseminate the relevant information.

---

[3]Walter W. Heller, "Employment and Aggregate Demand," prepared for the Conference on Unemployment and the American Economy, Berkeley, California, April 19, 1963, pp. 4-5.

Moreover, we have frequently failed to take cognizance of the signals which were transmitted to us. As a society we resist socio-economic change. As individuals and families we remain opportunely ignorant of the changes taking place about us and of their consequences.

Our institutions are highly static in orientation. Without anticipating what the panel will say tomorrow, let me simply assert that we need more flexibility in our institutions. Our institutions of higher learning have become preoccupied with technology and technological change with relatively little emphasis upon assisting people to adjust to technological changes. Our educational institutions have been slow to change vocational training programs. In some instances, we persist in training people for jobs which do not and will not exist. Our churches, with a heavy historical orientation, remain largely aloof from current socio-economic problems. Government policies and public spokesmen have failed to recognize the basic structural changes occurring in our society. Too often, we have scorned change, have fought vainly to perpetuate the status quo, and have imparted false hopes to people who were being subjected to the impacts of socio-economic change. This has been as characteristic of agriculture as of any other industry.

Given the large increase which will take place in the addition of young people to the labor force during the decade, the competition for jobs faced by farm to nonfarm migrants during the 1960's will be greater than during the past two decades, unless a higher rate of economic growth is achieved which entails a sharp expansion in employment. Also, there will likely be a greater premium in the future in training for occupations other than the blue collar categories.

These conclusions have implications with regard to the importance of vocational training to farm people who choose to migrate to nonfarm occupations and relative to the type of vocational program which should be made available to them. Clearly, the gains from investment in people in rural areas to prepare them for skilled occupations will be relatively high in the future as compared with the gains from migration to unskilled and semiskilled occupations.
demand and general unemployment or whether it represents a change in the fundamental structure of the job market.

Those who emphasize the problem of structural unemployment argue that in recent years serious imbalances in our labor markets have been associated

THE DISADVANTAGED: WHAT OF THE FUTURE

JOHN A. BAKER, Assistant Secretary
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

This opportunity to participate in a part of your annual conference is appreciated.

Your emphasis on the poverty and near poverty in rural America is particularly gratifying. The families who live under these conditions make up the largest number of deprived of any group in the Nation — a heavy burden on our national conscience and a handicap to our exercise of world leadership for democracy and freedom. These families need your friendship and support.

Yesterday, Howard Hjort identified the rural disadvantaged and described their condition and problems.

Today, I should like to mention some promising avenues of locally-initiated corrective action through which some problems of rural poverty may be solved and to indicate Federal programs of technical and financial assistance that may usefully be called upon to supplement local and private efforts.

Elimination of the causes of rural poverty is a major aim of the Department's rural areas development effort, a comprehensive activity to which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has assigned first priority emphasis.

8 Million More Rural Jobs in 10 Years

A good share of the causes of rural poverty, and the actions to correct them, are cultural and social. But an even greater share are broadly economic.

In economic terms, the magnitude of effort required to erase rural poverty can be expressed as the need to create over the next 10 years an equivalent of 8 million additional full-time jobs for rural Americans at national average wages. The equivalent of 4 million new full-time jobs will be required to eliminate existing underemployment and unemployment in rural areas, and new jobs will be required for 4 million more rural young people than will be able to find opportunity to replace retiring persons in adequately rewarding rural employment.

To bring about an increase of 8 million new economic opportunities in 10 years is no mean undertaking. But it is the responsibility we must project and undertake if we really seriously intend to attain a poverty-less rural America. Where can we look — what can we do — to find 8 million new jobs in 10 years for rural Americans?

For each of these jobs there are three prerequisites: An effective market for the product; the job itself; and a competent worker to fill it. To be successful over the long pull, action to create jobs must realistically encompass all three of these elements.

Adequate Family Farms

An increase in the number of adequate family farms will provide some new adequate jobs in the next 10 years. Farming is, and will continue to be, the backbone of the economy of most rural areas. With proper farm programs and policies, the number of adequate family farms can be increased at an even more rapid rate than has so far been attained. An important part of the solution of rural poverty, and, therefore, one of the major aims of the rural areas development effort, is to preserve and improve the family farm pattern of American agriculture.

A very large part of responsibility here rests with the individual farm operator and his family and with his free farm organizations and cooperative business institutions.

In furtherance of the Nation's traditional family farm policy, Congress has made available, through the Department of Agriculture, various useful services with which we are all familiar — income stabilization by means of commodity programs, crop insurance, and emergency and natural disaster loans — educational and technical assistance to reduce farm costs and adopt new enterprises and improved methods by means of extension of research results and program information; technical assistance through soil and water conservation districts and state foresters; loans, technical assistance, and counseling to farmers and cooperating groups of farmers for customary farming enterprises and new income-producing efforts such as grazing associations, outdoor recreation and farm vacation facilities, fish farming and farm forestry; and technical assistance, loans and cost-sharing payments to aid rural land owners to make fundamental long-term land use adjustments required by the national interest.

As you know, Secretary Freeman acted more than a year ago to improve and step up the integration and coordination of all the Department's family farm services in their application on a farm-by-farm basis.

Reliable economic projects indicate that the growing market for food, fiber, and timber will provide room for some of the needed additional rural opportunities on an increasing number of adequate family farms. But over-all, we must recognize that increasing productive efficiency of the family farm is such that a further drop in total farm employment must be expected. Obviously farming is not going to provide near all the equivalent of 8 million needed new jobs for rural Americans.

Rehabilitation-in-Place

These economic projections, also, clearly indicate that many rural and farm families who are enmeshed in poverty will not have room within agriculture to expand to fully adequate family farm operation, if indeed they had the will or ability owing to age, education, and physical handicap to do so. Of course, many of them do not.

Many farm people over 45 years of age, lacking basic general education, and often with debilitating physical handicap, even with the best available programs for manpower development and retraining, cannot in any large numbers be realistically expected to become skilled production workers in automated factories or office workers in a business. Nor can they aspire to fully adequate farm operation. Yet for many of these, the alternative to continuing to farm is migration to town or city to add their names to the relief and welfare rolls.

The course of civilized society is rehabilitation-in-place for these families, where some improvement in continued farming operations and obtaining of simple off-farm jobs will enable the attainment of some improvement in living levels that will make their lives more satisfying without migration away from the farm.

The services of all of the Department's farmer programs of loans, technical assistance, education, cost-sharing, and price supports are available to members of this group whose continuance in farming until retirement or voluntary migration has been projected in our long-range programming.

The key point as to national interest in regard to this group, in my thinking, is that the children growing up in these homes should be accorded some-

thing as nearly approaching an equality of educational opportunity and home environment as the situation allows so that the second and third generations will not be unable to escape the ever repeating cycles of poverty that breed poverty.

Part-Time Farming

Many rural families have been able to obtain adequate incomes by combining off-farm work with farming operations. In fact a sizable part of the total family income of the farm population is now from nonfarm sources, about half from wages and about half from nonfarm self-employment enterprises.

But some part-time farm families have not been able to obtain adequate incomes from all sources. Many of these low income part-time farmers can be enabled both to improve the income-producing ability of their part-time farm unit and to obtain more remunerative off-farm employment.

With a more rapid increase in off-farm employment opportunities in rural areas, part-time farming may well become an acceptable alternative for many able-bodied, young, educated, but currently low income, farm operators who would be unable to find room within the market for full-time, fully adequate family farm operation. I think we should not rule out fully adequate, part-time farming by considering it as merely a transitional phase of migration out of farming. Rather it may well become a way of life and making a living for an increasing number of rural families.

Rural Industrialization and Business Enterprise

Another major aspect of the nationwide rural areas development effort, and one which can make a major contribution to the new jobs required to eliminate rural poverty, is a much more rapid growth than we have thus far seen of industry, business, and trade and professional services in rural areas. This is commonplace, and every active Chamber of Commerce across the land has been working hard at it for years. But if rural poverty is to be solved we must work even harder, because certainly private industrial and business enterprise must provide a large bulk of the increased jobs required in rural America as well as in the Nation as a whole.

The contribution of nonfarm jobs in rural areas by cooperatives — owned and operated by farmers and other rural residents — has been more often overlooked than remarked. But the total employment so afforded is sizable.

Of vital importance to the spread of rural industrialization and encouragement of rural business enterprise has been the rural electric and telephone cooperatives and companies. With low cost and dependable rural power and telephones coupled with the improved network of roads and highways, no longer is industry and business tied to the waterfall, river port, and rail head. Industry can now afford to locate where people like to live — in the open country.

In addition to rural electric and telephone loans, the Rural Electrification Administration also administers in designated rural areas, the industrial and business loans of the Area Redevelopment Administration and cooperates closely with the Small Business Administration in making available its many valuable services within all rural areas.

We have leaned very heavily upon the volunteer services of REA borrowers for the promotion and encouragement of expanding business and industrial enterprise in rural areas. Many of them have responded, not only with leader-

ship and hard work, but also have made credit available from their own funds within the strict limits we have placed upon them. Many have, also, borrowed REA Section 5 loans on their own security to provide supplemental financing required to help new enterprise get started.

Experience indicates that the cooperative form of private business enterprise is uniquely adapted to the needs of rural areas. And we expect that cooperatives and other locally-owned businesses, other things equal, may well prove most successful in helping to eradicate the causes of rural poverty.

Public Investment and Expenditures

Public investment and expenditures by local, State, and Federal Governments in the many appropriate and needed ways have a triple role to play in the elimination of the causes of rural poverty and contributing to a more rapid rate of rural areas development.

First, good things, such as reforestation, new school buildings, public recreation facilities, that need to be done get done;

Second, the making of these investments and expenditures provides employment for people who need jobs; and

Third, making of such investments and expenditures provides the climate and social capital or infrastructure required in the area as a base for a more rapid rate of investment by the private sector.

The three-fold value of such investments and expenditures are well illustrated by the highly successful accelerated public works program during the year just past.

We have been gratified by the beneficial results from the participation of the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Cooperative State Experiment Station and Agricultural Research Services in the accelerted public works program.

The Farmers Home Administration provides loans and technical assistance to rural community water systems and administers in designated rural areas the public facilities loan and grant program of Area Redevelopment Administration. Working in close cooperation with the Community Facilities Administration and other agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Farmers Home Administration stands ready to assist rural communities and groups as well as individual rural residents with their developmental problems and programs. The provision of an adequate water supply and other community facilities is often the deciding factor in location of industry in a rural area.

Natural Resource Development and Conservation

The triple power of public investment to help abolish rural poverty is also illustrated by the Federal and State funds spent in the development and conservation of forests and other land and water resources. These expenditures provide continuing jobs; improved resources provide the base for expanding local industry and business; and the nation is richer by the improved resource security provided.

The multiple use concept adopted by Congress for our national forests is being rapidly expanded to State and privately owned forest crops and pasture lands. And the Forest Service, in recognition that a very large proportion of the areas of the greatest concentration of rural poverty are found adjacent to heavily forested areas, has moved to put special emphasis upon stabilization and more rapid economic growth of farm-forest communities and the development of better forestry on privately owned lands.

Similarly the expansion and conduct of publicly-financed fundamental long-term conservation of crop, pasture, forest, and recreational land and water resources provides to the poverty eradication program the same three-fold values.

In the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, Congress inaugurated a new program that could hold great promise in this field . . . Resource Conservation and Development projects. These projects, operated by local public authorities under State laws, will enable the correlation of public and private efforts on an area basis to serve needs not covered by other existing agricultural and soil conservation programs.

The Negro and Other Specially Handicapped Groups

The rural Negro, Indian, Spanish American, and the member of a few other special ethnic and racial groups are doubly disadvantaged. Consequently, they share all the debilitations of an even deeper poverty and have an even harder hill to climb to escape it. These problems, as the members of this Association know, are exceedingly complex and their solution requires a large variety of activities to solve. My mentioning them here is only to say that efforts to eliminate the causes of rural poverty must take these special difficult factors into account.

Members of these specially disadvantaged groups must be helped to understand that RAD services are fully available to them and they need to be helped to learn how to participate in them. This we are attempting to do. In addition to establishing a special equal-opportunities unit in the Office of Rural Areas Development, all of the Department's agencies with major rural areas development programs — Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Cooperative Service, and others are making special efforts to see that knowledge of and opportunity to participate in their programs and services are afforded on a truly equal basis to members of specially disadvantaged groups.

Hired Farm Workers

The causes of rural poverty cannot be eliminated until completely effective actions are taken to upgrade the status, pay, and working conditions of hired farm workers. And, in fact, the foundation for stable successful family farm adequacy cannot be assured until this is done. The Kennedy Administration is pledged to take such action. Hired farm workers can and should be accorded the same status recognition and treatment as nonfarm wage workers.

Outdoor Recreation

Of all the alternatives for improved land use adjustment and increasing job opportunities in rural areas, the one prospect with the apparently most rapidly expanding effective demand for the product appears to be in the field of outdoor recreation.

The development of farmland and other outdoor recreation facilities promises to produce some of the 8 million new jobs that we need in rural America in the next decade.

The demand for outdoor recreation has zoomed since World War II. Today, outdoor recreation is a $20 billion a year business. We are expanding recreational facilities in the National Forest; State and National Parks are being improved. But the need for new outdoor recreation facilities cannot and should not be met on public land alone. It must be met in large part on the

privately-owned farms and ranches within easy driving distance of our major cities.

To help farmers switch from the growing of excess crops to the marketing of recreation, the Department now offers a new but limited selection of loans, cost-sharing agreements, and technical assistance. Congress established these new activities under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

When it was first revealed that the Department of Agriculture could make recreation loans, we received more than 5,000 queries within a matter of weeks. The first loans were announced less than three months ago. At last count, the Department had loaned more than one-half million dollars to 47 individuals and four associations to develop shooting preserves, on-farm accommodations for vacationers, picnic and camping facilities, and lakes for boating, fishing, and swimming. I would like to emphasize that these are loans that must be repaid with interest. That interest rate is currently five percent.

We also are helping farmers switch to recreation through a cropland conversion program. This program, which is part of the overall Rural Areas Development program, provides for 5- to 10-year agreements with farmers to convert cropland to recreation, or to grass, forests, or wildlife use. An adjustment payment is made on land suitable for continuous cropping to encourage farmers to participate in this program, and to help them meet the cost of establishing the new use. Latest figures show that about 250 farmers in 41 states have filed applications to convert nearly 19,000 acres to recreation.

There are already thousands of farmland recreation areas in rural America. And many of the operators are making money. I know of one rancher who reports that he made $2,500 running cattle on his range, and received $72,000 from elk hunters. This is, of course, an exception. But there is money to be made in providing the recreation that city dwellers want and need. Studies show that 24 tourists a day can bring as much money to a community as a plant with a $100,000 a year payroll.

Watershed Projects and Rural Housing

It may seem strange that I should mention watershed projects and rural housing loans in the same sentence and in the same section of this paper. Certainly they bring about tangible end products that are quite different. A newly completed watershed protection project and a new rural home look quite different.

But in terms of wiping out some of the root causes of rural poverty they both have special and valuable properties in common. They both contribute to increased employment during the period of construction. But even more importantly they appear to add a large plus quantity to the marginal efficiency of capital in the rural area where constructed. They add an ingredient of renewed hope and faith in the future. And economists tell me that the psychological content of the expectations that govern investment decisions is quite high.

Whatever the reason, our experience has been that watershed projects and new rural homes have drawn new industry, new business activity, improved public facilities and a new spirit of enterprise and optimism in every rural area in which they have been erected. Certainly expansion of both these programs is essential for the success of the on-going rural areas development program to provide the needed jobs to reduce rural poverty.

Rural Renewal

In 1962, Congress enacted a completely new program which we are in-

augurating on a very cautious and gradual basis. But in the long run, it may well turn out to be one of the most fundamental steps we have taken in these years toward the ultimate eradication of the causes of rural poverty. We call this new approach a program of rural renewal projects. It is expected that the governments of a local rural area of workable size may join together under enabling state laws and request to be designated as a rural renewal project area. In addition to all of the other rural areas development programs of the Department of Agriculture and other agencies of the Federal government which could be utilized n the area, special personnel would be assigned to aid local leaders in developing activities completely to revitalize the area.

Special loans to such local public authorities would be available from the Farmers Home Administration to meet those needs of the area as could not be met through the regular programs now in operation. It would be expected that in such areas no stone would be left unturned to discover and improve every possible avenue for raising the income and living standards of the people of the area. In some respects we are looking upon this new program as somewhat analagous to the successful urban renewal programs of our cities.

Planning, Promotion, and Integration

In many different parts of the country highly promising rural areas development activity is underway.

These gratifying success stories, which every day are multiplying, are the direct result of hard, dedicated, volunteer work of many thousands of local area development leaders who have given selflessly of their time, energy, and fortune to pull together all of the diverse forces in their areas to capture the hybrid vigor of group activity. Basing our decision on the successful examples of countless farmers' cooperatives, of the fine working relationships of REA and the electric and telephone cooperatives' boards of SCS and the boards of supervisors of soil and water conservation districts, of the democratically elected farmer committee system, and of the volunteer advisory committees of the Extension Services, we have grounded the rural areas development program on lay volunteer local, state, and national rural areas development committees and boards, or whatever name they choose to adopt.

To provide them with the highly competent expert assistance in the techniques of group action for economic development, we asked the cooperative Federal-State Extension Service to assume responsibility for educational and organizational leadership of rural areas development efforts throughout the Nation.

After 30 months of nationwide operation we are gratified with tangible indications of progress.

We have seen enough to be sure that the causes of rural poverty can be eliminated from the land of rural America. But we have also seen enough to know that rural America cannot prosper alone.

General Education and National Economic Growth

If our nationwide efforts to eradicate the causes of rural poverty are to have a fair chance to succeed, if rural areas development is to be more than a wheel-spinning effort to move uphill on slick footing, progress must be made simultaneously toward attainment of two worthy high priority, national goals — (1) widespread, high quality general education and (2) a more rapid rate of national economic growth (and a lower chronic level of unemployment) than we have seen for the past decade.

Rural areas development is a special and unique approach within a na-

tional full employment program and cannot succeed unless the whole succeeds. Adoption of the many nonfarm and nonrural employment increasing proposals and of the proposed Federal tax cut are as essential to the success in eliminating the causes of rural poverty as are the specialized rural areas development programs I have outlined. New jobs for 8 million rural Americans cannot be created unless the economy as a whole can meet the challenge of a needed 60,000 new jobs each week to replace jobs abolished by automation in office and factory and the large numbers of the war babies joining the work force.

Similarly, expanding demand can create the need for new workers but the job cannot be filled unless there is a properly trained worker. And the best of manpower development and retraining programs cannot properly provide workers to fill jobs unless the potential trainees have sufficient general education to benefit from the specialized training. I am convinced that local and State tax bases are not sufficient to cope with this national problem and Federal aid to general as well as vocational education on a national basis is required.

Proposed Rural Life Commission

Change in rural America is taking place at an unprecedented rate. None of us is sure where it is headed or whether the efforts we have underway are what the future demands that we should be doing now.

There is a growing awareness that America's land and water resources should be increasingly utilized for national needs other than farming. Much research has been done on the fundamental changes that are occurring in our rural areas. For many citizens and public leaders, however, this accumulation of fact and opinion remains unclear in its implication. There is great need for evaluation of present research. It is important to investigate even further some of the puzzling facets of our national rural life in order to bring our needs and goals into sharper focus.

This was done for the Nation by a Commission on Country Life in the early years of this century during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Recently, President Kennedy had submitted to Congress a bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life along the lines of the proposed legislation put forward by members of your Association for many past years. The purpose of the Commission would be to study the rapid changes under way in rural America and to find ways to preserve and nurture recognized values of country living. The Commission would advise and recommend courses of action which would help the Nation act wisely in this era of drastic change in rural community living.

This bill has been introduced into the Senate by Senators Hartke, Bayh, Burdick, Church, Gruening, Hart, Humphrey, Javits, Inouye, McGee, McGovern, Muskie, Nelson, Randolph, and Yarborough. It has not yet been introduced into the House, but is under discussion in the House Subcommittee on the Family Farm.

I am proud that the Administration of which I am a part has seen fit to back the proposal so many of you have sponsored. We will need your continued guidance and support. We shall appreciate your counsel at all times. I hope particularly that you will bring to my attention the things we are not doing that we ought to be doing and the things that we are doing wrong that ought to be corrected.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss these matters with you.

Panel Discussion —
TYPES OF DISADVANTAGED

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

FRELL M. OWL
Cherokee, North Carolina

Approximately 300 tribal groups of American Indians reside within the boundaries of the United States. These groups are distributed in more than thirty states, including Alaska. The majority live west of the Mississippi River. The legal status of a tribal group, band, community, or pueblo is complicated as each may exist as a distinct entity. A group may or may not be under the supervision of the United States Government.

The estimated population of American Indians ranges from 385,000 to 500,000. Accurate record keeping of population is difficult because Indians live in both reservation and nonreservation areas. The Navajo, boasting a population of approximately 80,000, is the largest Indian tribe. Smaller tribes often number less than one hundred persons. Other tribes may number several hundred or several thousand. Statistics show that Indians are increasing quite rapidly.

Generally, American Indians live in a rural environment. The communities where they live are known as reservations or nations and are areas of land set aside for Indian use. Whether an Indian lives on or away from his designated reservation is his individual choice. Generally 10 to 15% of a tribal group have moved from reservation to nonreservation areas. Relocated Indians often lose their official identity as Indians.

Most tribal groups maintain a close legal relationship with the United States Government. The Federal Government serves as trustess for most Indian tribes. The trustee protects real property belonging to tribal groups or to individual Indians. Indian owned land, for example, is often held in trust by the Federal Government. The trustee may also provide a variety of services in his effort to civilize Indians. Among common services are federal Indian schools, federal hospitals, law and order personnel, welfare grants, road construction, probate of trust property, development of forest and range resources, and a host of other services. However, in rendering service to Indian tribes or individual Indians, the federal trustee restricts its services to Indians who are enrolled members of specific tribes and who maintain residence on reservations or other trust land. Federal services are restricted also to Indians who are not able to secure assistance from state, county, and local sources. The legal relationship between the United States Government and Indian tribes is firmly established. Most Indian tribes and individual Indians resist efforts of Congress to terminate these long standing relationships.

The general public normally has a vague knowledge of Federal-Indian relationships. The basic source of federal power in Indian affairs is contained in the Federal Constitution. A provision in Article I, Section 8, empowers Congress "to regulate commerce — with Indian tribes." Additional federal authority is contained in treaties the United States Government made with various Indian tribes. Further authority is contained in numerous statutes Congress enacted on behalf of Indian tribes. The moral responsibility of the conqueror to the conquered cannot be disregarded as a source of power for the United States to deal with Indian affairs.

An interesting phase of the relationship of the United States with Indian tribes is the obvious independent status of a tribal group. An Indian tribe exercises a certain degree of sovereignty in managing its domestic affairs. A federal court defined an Indian tribe as "a distinct political entity, clothed with ample authority to govern its inhabitants and to manage its domestic affairs through officers of its own selection." Therefore, in some areas of Indian life, neither the Federal nor the State Government has power to interfere with Tribal self-government. The result is that Indian tribes are inclined to live isolated and segregated from the mainstream of American life.

In its effort to free American Indians from disadvantages arising from the traditional Federal Indian System, Congress conferred full American citizenship on Indians by the Act of June 2, 1924. Although the United States has employed many devices and techniques to civilize Indians over a period of approximately 140 years, Indian groups, as a general rule, exist at the bottom of the American economic ladder.

Statistics released by federal authorities throw some light on the nature of disadvantages among Indians. Adult Indians are about one-half as well educated as adult Americans. Death rate among Indians is higher than the average. Adult Indians live about two-thirds as long as adult Americans. Unemployment among Indians is six to seven times the national average. Annual income for Indians is from one-fourth to one-third as large as the national average. The average Indian has attained a sixth grade education. Drop-out rate among Indians is considerably higher than among non-Indian school children. A limited number of Indians have achieved the distinction of becoming professional people. The majority of administrators working with the Federal Indian Service are non-Indians. But despite these gloomy statistics, numerous individuals have emerged from the Indian environment to take a place higher up on the American economic ladder.

Most Indian groups exist somewhere near the bottom of the economic ladder. These are the disadvantaged Indians because they have not successfully adjusted from native culture to the culture of a dominant people. Actually, American Indians as a group have not put forth maximum effort in changing cultures. Indian attitudes toward change have not been favorable, even though the United States Government has tried to be a big brother and a partner to encourage change.

Two characteristics are notable in Indians: a rich heritage and a unique spirit of independence. A desire to retain the Indian way of life has motivated resistance to change. Independence has created the so-called Indian problem that has baffled even the Indian's best friends.

It is a good gesture for the American Country Life Association in its annual meeting to show concern for the welfare of Indians. The result may be a boost for the education and training of Indian youth.

APPALACHIAN WHITE

MILTON OGLE
Council of Southern Mountains, Inc.
Berea, Kentucky

The story that I am about to tell may be somewhat unrelated to the subject, but I'm going to tell it anyway. There was a young lady who was expecting her first child, and when it came time for her to go to the hospital her husband was busy so she took the bus. She arrived with time to spare and her baby was born. When it came time for her to return home, her husband was busy again, so she brought the child home on a train.

Well, she was sitting there very lovingly minding her baby and a man wandered by who was intoxicated. He took one look at the baby and said, "Lady, that's undoubtedly the ugliest young un I ever saw!" This rash statement just about broke the lady up. She went into hysterics and could not control herself. About that time, the conductor walked by and seeing that she was very upset, asked her what was the matter. Well, she was so shaken that she couldn't tell him. Then he said, "I'll tell you what let's do, let's go back to the dining car and get a cup of coffee. This will help you to settle down and you can tell me what's bothering you." She looked up at him, and he said, "Now come on, I'll get you a cup of coffee, and I'll get your monkey a banana, too."

Sometimes I feel that this type of mistake is made as we attempt to assist the disadvantaged Appalachian whites. The disadvantaged Appalachian whites are disadvantaged by a number of things. One of these things is geography. A large part of the Appalachians is characterized by narrow valleys and high ridges. We find people living at urban density in some of these areas, but under rural standards. They have the outdoor toilet and the water well, both in close range of the house. Sanitation in such communities is practically impossible because of the lack of adequate physical space.

Then we find some areas that are very sparsely populated. These are primarily subsistence farm areas where mining has never been more than a very small part of the economic base. Education and transportation for these people are difficult and very expensive. It isn't that these areas have been overlooked by government nearly so much as it is the fact that it costs so much to build roads and provide services in a mountain area. Sometimes the cost of building a mountain road is three to five times the amount a similar road would cost on a level to rolling terrain. I am sure we all realize that adequate transportation is very important to the development and the creation of opportunity.

Many Appalachian people are disadvantaged because of their insularism. They are insulated to what goes on in other places. As a result the professional who works directly with these groups of Appalachian people finds them very slow to take advantage of the professional knowledge that is offered. These people are disadvantaged by their own community norms — what they expect of themselves and their families.

I know a young man who is an agricultural extension agent in an Appalachian county, who came from a home that belonged to a very fundamentalist group. Although formal education had very little sanction within his family this young man continued in school and received a high school diploma. All of the time that he was in school he was ridiculed and harassed for getting beyond his "raisin'." Education beyond the fifth or sixth grade level was not

a part of the norm of his community and family. Not only did he go to high school, but he went on to college and got a bachelor's degree. Following that, he joined the Presbyterian Church — he lost his religion — and now he's working on his master's degree.

This young man now finds it impossible to visit his parents for more than a few minutes without getting into a hassel of some kind concerning education or religion. His people are very serious about this. They are honest in their disdain for education and religion that embodies only a moderate degree of sophistication. I am sure you realize that it is a very uncomfortable process that a young person must go through to break through the crust that has been set on achievements by the adult population. This situation of low but rigid standards having the sanction of the adult population exists in many different communities in the Appalachian area.

The Appalachian area is disadvantaged by lack of economic sources. The per capita expenditure per pupil in education is about ½ the national average. In 1958, 25% of the public elementary schools were one-teacher establishments. This does not mean that 25% of the children were in one-teacher schools because one consolidated school can serve as many children as a dozen or more one-teacher schools. It is of significance, however, to note that there still exist communities which provide their children with this very minimal type of education.

The people in coal producing areas of the Appalachians have been the victims of a resource. What is the motivation for a young man to continue in school when he is perfectly sure in his mind that as an illiterate he can get a better paying job at the age of 14 than his school teacher has. This has been the situation in the Appalachian coal areas that has contributed much to the undereducated status of the adult population.

I wish to make some distinction between the coal producing areas and the subsistence farm areas because I think they are different. In the case of the mining areas we have entire communities oriented toward the industrial payrolls without having to plan day by day or year by year for their existence. Whereas on the farm we have people who have had to plan in advance what they were going to do and how they were going to do it in order that they might subsist. They didn't have the coal companies to look after their affairs as did the miners, neither did they have a union to look after their affairs as did the miners. I feel that the paternalism of the unions and coal companies has had a very degenerate effect on the people they have, "so-called", taken care of.

In this country we are an urban-oriented society. Our standards and our bases of evaluation are derived from urban situations. The Appalachian area is ⅓ urban while the nation as a whole is ⅔ urban, and I feel that in terms of evaluation this serves as a disadvantage to the Appalachian people.

The Appalachian people are disadvantaged by ignorance. The median educational level of adults, 25 years old and over, in the Appalachian South, is 8.2 years compared to 10.6 years in the nation as a whole, and as a nation we are undereducated. We find that we have jobs open sometimes equal to the number of people unemployed in a labor-surplus area and yet the people who are unemployed do not have the backgrounds to accept the jobs that are open. During the past year this situation has existed in Detroit, Louisville, and in many other labor-surplus areas. As a nation, we are undereducated and the Appalachian area lags far behind the nation as a whole.

In the Appalachian South we are low on income. Our median family income is $3,102, as compared with $5,660 in the nation as a whole. I don't believe, however, that just increasing income would really change the level of living very much. It changed little when the wages of miners went from $5 a day to $20 a day, because the people did not know what to do with the additional money. They didn't know how to use it to enrich their lives, so their level of thinking, their level of aspiration, the things that are important according to our standards, didn't really change. They lack knowledge of proper nutrition — with good incomes we still find malnutrition. They lack knowledge of sanitation as is evidenced by their placement of outdoor toilets without pits in close proximity to their water supply, and the lack of screens on the windows even when they can afford them.

In some counties more than 70% of the people are on some type of public assistance. Because of their lack of knowledge in nutrition we find recipients of the surplus commodities program getting very little value from it. We hear stories of cheese being used for doorstops, rice and yellow corn being fed to the chickens, and many others that follow this central theme. They lack the knowledge that is needed for health and development.

I would say that practically all of the disadvantages which we face in the Appalachian region could be solved by doing away with ignorance. I think ignorance is the basic thing in our society and our economy that causes disadvantages. I think it is a challenge to every facet of our society, particularly education, government, and communities to face up to this problem of underdeveloped human beings, and to create opportunities by which people can develop to their full potential. I feel that we must provide opportunities in such a way that people are made more independent, more resourceful, rather than using the current stop-gap measures which leave a person with no ability to move ahead on his own and be proud of it.

MIGRANTS

REV. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.
National Catholic Rural Life Conference
Washington, D.C.

In talking about migrants in the United States, it's very difficult to know how many people are involved. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. Government spends more money every year in counting and tracing the migration patterns of birds than in counting and tracing the patterns of migratory citizens.

The result is that there is a wide variation in estimates of how many migrants there are. The estimates vary anywhere from half a million to two million. Whatever the number might be — my own guess is that it's around a million to a million and a quarter — migratory workers in the United States are made up very largely of two minority groups; that is, the Negro and the Mexican American.

The existence of a migratory labor force can be traced, I think, historically right back to slavery. With the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation, slavery was legally abolished. But the agriculture of the South, built on this institution, simply shifted to the sharecropping and tenant system which represented very little improvement economically, socially, and otherwise for the former Negro slaves.

Today the agricultural revolution is making so many tenants, farm hands, and sharecroppers superfluous in the agricultural process that literally hundreds of thousands of these people have now been uprooted and swept off the farms. With no developed skill or education or experience to make it possible for them to find a better way of life in industry and in urban life, by the tens or hundreds of thousands they have joined the already overcrowded migratory labor stream.

In the southwest and west, and increasingly in the upper midwest, another adaptation to slavery was made. There was another major racial group available to be exploited, the Mexicans in Mexico and Mexican Americans. A whole new system of agriculture, involving mainly fruits and vegetables, but also cotton and other products, grew up to take advantage of this disadvantaged and available labor force.

As a result today we have two major migratory labor groups and two major migratory labor patterns:

There is the Negro who starts in Florida and adjoining states and migrates up along the eastern coast. The Mexican Americans start in the southwest and work their way either up the midcontinent to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, or direct themselves west through Arizona and southern California up to Oregon and Washington, and even into Idaho and Montana.

Socially and economically these people, both Negroes and Mexican Americans, are among the most deprived people in our country. Their average yearly income last year was less than $1000. They were able to find work for less than 130 days during the year. They have been the victims of direct legal discrimination. They have been specifically excluded from almost every piece of social and welfare legislation that has been passed in this country during these last 30 years. They are, as it's euphemistically put, "exempt" from the National Labor Relations Act. They are equally exempt from the minimum wage law. They are only in very small part and very ineffectually covered by Social Security.

What's more, for some years they have had the added burden, the almost incredible burden, of direct competition from hundreds of thousands of even more poverty stricken citizens of Mexico. Floods of these Braceros have been brought in by employers and growers because the Mexicans are cheaper and more docile; they can be transported as gangs of single men and kept in quasi concentration camp barracks; they can be moved here, there, or elsewhere without any choice on their part; they can be had when needed and gotten rid of when the job is done; they can be and are blacklisted if they ever protest.

As a result of all of these conditions and because of their essentially migratory condition, the social, educational, economic, and family life of U.S. migratory workers has rightly, even somewhat bitterly, been called "a badge of infamy on the American conscience."

In the question of health, they are subject to diseases at rates up to ten times higher than normal American standards. Whether it's dysentery or tuberculosis or anything from the most casual to the most critical illness, their medical and health situation is without question the worst in the United States.

When migratory labor occasionally gets into the news it's usually because of the death of infants from dysentery or from starvation; or it might be because of a spectacular accident between a truck carrying migrants and a train where 20 - 30 - 40 people are killed outright.

The completed education for migrant adults averages just over five grades of grammar school. Present trends indicate that their children are getting less education, more spotty and more ineffective education, than their parents.

Becausse they are migratory they rarely if ever qualify for emergency welfare or medical help from county or state.

Because they are migratory and because they are discriminated against on other counts they rarely have a citizen's voice on voting and in choosing their representatives.

Because they are migratory they are almost impossible to organize into responsible unions.

Because they are migratory they have no single coordinated voice of their own speaking in their own behalf.

Their situation is a criminal indictment on American society. And the situation tomorrow is likely to be even worse. Because of the very rapid mechanization of agriculture, these people who have found migratory labor in the fields as the only economic opportunity open to them will soon find these jobs not available unless something effective is done soon. There will be no place at all for them on the American economic scene.

THE NEGRO

B. D. MAYBERRY, Dean
School of Agriculture
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

This is the third opportunity that I have had to attend the annual meeting of the American Country Life Association and each time I have been representing someone else. Today is no exception. I am representing Dr. Floyd who could not be here because of a conflicting meeting, involving Teachers of Vocational Agriculture and New Farmers of America. He expressed regret that he could not be present; however, I am happy to represent him on this occasion.

The general theme of this conference is, "Our Concern for the Disadvantaged." In classifying the disadvantaged, I must admit that the Negro must — as a race — be included. I will attempt to point out some of the disadvantages, as if you didn't know already, and relate some of my personal experiences. Subsequently, some time will be given to questions and discussion.

I am reminded first of Dr. Moton, second president of Tuskegee Institute, who had very large feet. Each year he had to inventory all school property. When making the land inventory he always came out one acre short. He was finally reminded that he failed to count the one on which he was standing.

It often happens that we are so close to our problems that we do not see them. This situation is most applicable with those of us who think and talk about "the Negro problem." The real problem is not one of the Negro, but of the total society. If I am in error and there is a real Negro problem, I would like very much to know what it is.

The Negro is disadvantaged by his image as seen and conceived by society. Those of us who have cultivated certain misguided concepts of the Negro will readily admit that he is all right in "his place." This, of course, implies relegation to second class citizenship. In this case, the Negro is viewed as a lazy, backward, untidy, careless, homogeneous race of people rather than individuals widely varied as in the case of other races.

Earlier this year I had the opportunity to visit several high schools in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas for the purpose of recruiting. At each high school my leading question was, "What is agriculture?" My main interest happens to be agriculture, so I asked this question. Invariably the answer was that agriculture is farming. Further, most of our present dictionaries will define agriculture as farming.

Today agriculture is much broader than farming. It is not only production or farming — as it is commonly called — but also processing, distribution, marketing, and many phases of engineering. Through science and technology, agriculture involves essentially all phases of the physical and biological sciences. This is particularly true of chemistry, mathematics, physics, and biology. Food science and technology alone involve every facit of the natural sciences.

In spite of the broad expanse of scientific and technological career opportunities in agriculture, there are those of us who cling to the misconception that agriculture is farming and is a dying industry. To hold to this old concept is a very vivid expression of a lack of knowledge.

We should not be surprised since it is very common for human beings to be down on what they are not up on. That is the way we are about agriculture. The real problem here is one of having a misconceived image. Because of this image it is difficult to get high ability high school students to elect scientific careers in agriculture. When you say "agriculture" to them, you mean "farming." I am trying to illustrate what happens when one has an erroneous preconceived image. So with the Negro, I feel that this is the problem.

There are those who put all Negroes in the same category. If you say "Negro" you mean something in common; you don't mean a variety of personalities. I imagine that there are white people who you would not like as your neighbor. Not because they are white, but because of their individual personalities or the characteristics of the family. We as Negroes would like

to be looked at as individuals; not collectively "the Negro" and then referred to as "the Negro problem."

I had an experience here in North Carolina which I will pass on to you. Before doing this I will give you a little background. In addition to being the Dean of the School of Agriculture, I am Director of the Isotope and Radiation Technology Program at Tuskegee Institute. Recently the Atomic Energy Commission granted Tuskegee funds to be used in making a study relative to the establishment of an interdepartmental curriculum in biological and industrial applications of isotopes and radiation. The program included funds to visit several industries in North Carolina, which are now using isotope in quality control processes.

While traveling from Greensboro to Charlotte, I had a severe headache and concluded that aspirin might be the answer. So I stopped at a Howard Johnson, walked right through the front door and up to the counter where I stood to be waited on. A young lady walked up to me and said, "I am sorry but if you want to be waited on you will have to go out and around to the back." This, of course, before she asked for my order.

Well, you would have been angry if you had been told that. I was not. In fact, I was not even insulted. My most profound feeling was of sorrow and forgiveness for her lack of undertanding.

This incident was not associated with income, education, or personality. Then the one question is, "Why did she do it?" She did not serve me because of her image of the Negro. If it is a Negro he is not entitled to sit and eat. As a matter of fact I did not even want to eat. I had a headache and simply wanted a box of aspirin.

There is one other experience that I would like to relate relative to having the wrong image or misconception. While at Michigan State University one of my professors and I made reservations through the mail at a hotel in Columbus, Ohio, where we were planning to attend the A.I.B.S. meeting at Ohio State University. Upon arrival at the hotel the desk clerk expressed great sorrow at having made the mistake of accepting our request when the rooms were all taken. He returned our deposit and we went on to a second hotel to find a very courteous desk clerk explaining that the rooms were all taken. After three attempts to get reservations, without success, I persuaded the professor to return to the second hotel, alone, and register for a room for two men while I remained on the street with our luggage. This he did with no difficulty at all. Once he had registered and received his room keys we went in together and remained there for three days without any problems.

This, of course, is the main dfference in what we run into in the North and what we run into in the South. I am not one of those who says sc much about what happens to the Negro from a racial point of view in the South as compared with the North, because I have lived both places. Frankly, if I must have segregation — and I don't want it either place and we hope to get rid of it every place — but if I just have to have it I'd rather have it the Southern way because there can be no mistake. This is the problem that faces us. In the North you don't know where to go, but in the South you know. Now that does not mean that I like it in the South; segregation and discrimination must, and will be, discontinued nationwide.

"Job opportunity" is something else we have to take into consideration. Just two weeks ago I attended a meeting at Norfolk, Virginia, at which time Mr. Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, spoke. He spent quite a bit of time pointing

out how unready the Negro is for many of the job opportunities that are now available to him. I did not know just where he was going, so the longer he talked the warmer I got. You know I have heard so much about "The Negro isn't ready" with no further reason or solution. After Mr. Wirtz had gone quite a long way in explaining that many job opportunities would not be filled by Negroes, he raised the question: "Why aren't they ready?" And of course he answered it. He said, "The Negro isn't ready for many of the job opportunities that are now available because we have deprived him of an opportunity to get ready."

I do not know how many of us here today are strong enough to accept this. I know that the question was raised this morning as to whether or not education was responsible for the lack of preparedness. I am firmly convinced that the solution to the inequality in housing, and in many other respects, is due to lack of education.

Full citizenship is one of the other things that we would like very much to enjoy in the American way of life. Whatever that means, we have not had it to a very great extent in the South.

In my home county of Macon there are 27,000 people, includng Tuskegee Institute. The population is six to one; six Negroes to every white in the county. Yet there's not a single Negro public official in the entire county. It was not until just recently that we could even vote. It took me three years to transfer my registration from Madison County, Alabama, to Macon County, Alabama, because I did not have enough education to vote. This, in spite of the fact that I had earned a Ph.D. degree from Michigan State University.

I do not think we ought to be called a "problem" because we want to vote, to take part in civic activities, to hold public office; and particularly in a case where we outnumber the whites six to one and where the income of the county is Negro 89%. Yet, a few years ago we were gerrymandered out of the city of Tuskegee. When the city limits were changed it included every white person's house in town and excluded almost all Negroes. That is how they did it. Of course now that has been changed, and the city limits have returned to their original status.

Now in closing, I must admit that the Negro is among the disadvantaged. He is disadvantaged by the false image. He is disadvantaged by being considered homogeneous as a race. He is disadvantaged by relegation to second class citizenship. The Negro's current effort to free himself of these disadvantages has resulted in being considered a problem, hence the popular phrase, "The Negro Problem." This is not a Negro problem alone, but a problem to be solved through understanding by all citizens.

Panel Discussion . . .

WHAT IS BEING DONE . . .

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

WESLEY LYNCH

State Extension Agricultural Program Development Leader

West Virginia University — Institute, West Virginia

It is indeed a pleasure to be here, representing the Cooperative Extension Service of West Virginia which functions under the able and capable leadership of Dr. Ernest J. Nesius, and to tell you about what we are doing with Rural Areas Development (RAD).

RAD is an approach that faces up to the challenge of total resource development in the rural areas of West Virginia and throughout America. Cooperative Extension Service has the task of helping communities to understand this approach and what it can do. In West Virginia this task is being done by my colleagues and myself. Miss Gertrude Humphreys, an active member of ACLA, who is our State Extension Home Demonstration Leader, has been instrumental in many of the success stories that have developed through the implementation of this program in our State.

When the RAD program started in West Virginia in 1961, many of our Extension workers were invited to Jacksonville to discuss the over-all program and to plan the procedures and ways to meet the challenge.

West Virginia is an area designated as one of those with persistent, chronic, and substantial unemployment. As such our Extension program was delegated the organizational and educational responsibility to organize and motivate people in various communities. Dr. Baker has pointed out how far we can go in motivating people.

Basically we are a weak state economically. Thousands of jobs have been lost because of automation and mechanization. This, coupled with competition of oil imports from foreign countries, has affected the economic status of every individual in mining areas and also those in other parts of the state. We feel we can become strong again and we must disseminate an image of a state that is working to become strong economically.

There is the story of the gentleman who was asked why he was so strong and healthy at his age. He went on to say, "In our household, my wife and I have decided that any time we have an argument I should get my hat and go out and walk around the block four times." Then he added, "You'd be surprised what twenty-five years of exercise will do for a person."

We hope to get strong in West Virginia. We feel we're on the way. We have organized county Overall Economic Development Programs (OEDP) in approximately 53 counties. In addition to local communities to create local and individual economic projects we also have state, county, and business projects.

Many counties and communities have projects in the arts and crafts program. They are designed to increase the family income. These projects supplement regular incomes by opening up these areas to people who have some income. In the arts and crafts program we have successfully coordinated and cooperated with other state agencies. As a result the State Department of Commerce in cooperation with other agencies has held art and craft classes

at Cedar Lake, Jackson County, and other areas of the State. These courses have been attended by approximately 15,000 persons who are interested in the crafts program and mutual interest activities.

In the area of community projects it isn't just the desire to see and hear presentations by special agencies, but our objective is to encourage an interest in and make people aware of the need of creating jobs. In other words, to get results in terms of dollars and cents through increased income through job placements.

Extension creates an awareness and motivates people to plan projects, to submit applications for processing, to get government loans to finance individual or community projects. Either approach is expected to improve the over-all economic status of the State. Extension's policy is to work with other agencies, to put forth an effort of coordination and cooperation for the reconstruction, revitalization, and revival of our State of West Virginia.

A declaration of principle has been recognized from the beginning between agencies throughout the State. This cooperation and dedication to a challenge in economic growth in our State has resulted, since 1961, in the securing of over 10,000 new jobs from 172 industries which have either built new plants or expanded their operations. Thousands of additional jobs have been secured and developed through individual and state motivated efforts.

Many of the communities are now in the process of having RAD tourist and recreational projects evaluated or planned that will support the economic growth in a six-county project area. We have received reports that they are progressing satisfactorily. We are getting things done reasonably soon after the loss of jobs due to the coal mining mechanization and automation, and to the releasing of farm employees through farm technology and mechanization.

To get at the root of it, many of us in agriculture believe there is a need for more training. And on many occasions training programs have been held for Extension workers by our university so that we can in turn do our jobs more effectively through visits to the communities. We need to organize and teach individuals and groups. They need to understand the approach and acquire knowledge and skills to plan and develop projects effectively.

I am basically an agriculturist, and of course in that capacity there is little that I could do without training in the area of economics and sociology and other necessary areas. This type of training of Extension personnel for professional improvement has helped immeasurably.

There are two areas of growth potential for economic satisfaction and job placements in the State outside of industry and agriculture. Those are tourism and recreation which could very well serve to make West Virginia the Switzerland of America.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

R. E. JONES
State Agent in Charge of Negro Work
A & T College of North Carolina — Greensboro, North Carolina

In the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, we are concerned with low income groups because North Carolina is a state of small farms. The per farm income of a number of operators is relatively low. The median family income for low income groups is something that gives us a lot of concern.

We have considerable diversity in our agriculture and farming. We speak of North Carolina, geographically, as the mountain section, the coastal plain section, the tidewater area, and the great piedmont area.

The farms in North Carolina are some of the smallest in the nation. We have a tremendous volume of labor; and in some enterprises, we have not moved towarrd adequate mechanization which has some reference to productive ability and the level of living and per capita income.

The Extension Service has a responsibility to organize and to provide leadership by way of rural areas development, known in North Carolina as the "North Carolina Council of Area and Community Development." A number of agencies, both governmental and private, as well as state, are participating in this over-all program of economic development, agricultural development. We have a trade and tourist section as well as a community development section.

Through volunteer efforts on the part of communities we have helped families in communities and neighborhoods to organize formal structures, with emphasis being on the solving of some of the problems of the people within the area. Numerous private groups, individuals, institutions, and organizations have given of their time and support in attempting to create a climate of motivation in action programs that solve some of the basic problems of families through 1) increasing income; 2) family living; 3) youth development; and 4) community projects.

We have another program where we work with ministerial groups. We have held a town and rural ministers' institute at A & T College for 11 years, where we bring together all denominations. We take a look at some of the basic problems and concerns of communities, counties, and areas, which have some reference to the research and extension programs and concerns of people stemming out of the land-grant college system.

Our experiences with these ministerial workshops have been very fruitful. We think, in terms of the leadership role of ministers and the fact that a number of churches are concentrated in rural and village communities, there is a real opportunity for leadership persuasion by way of the role of ministers and churches in rural North Carolina, that can help us break a little bit of this cycle of poverty, pockets of low income, low levels of living, and low educational levels.

The best expression of individual, group, and institutional support is reflected in the development of community organizations and activities that stem out of the leadership of the Agricultural Extension Service. Numerous private enterprise groups, state, district, and local educational agencies, along with private enterprise groups, join in helping to create a climate of program action, solution of problems, and reaching of goals beyond which families and communities have attained.

PRIVATE GROUPS

REV. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J., Chairman
National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor
Washington, D.C.

In Washington there are literally hundreds of voluntary agencies of all kinds, church and synagogue groups, labor, farm, consumer, service, civic, and welfare organizations. These groups and their spokesmen have considerable

influence in the development and formulation of public policy, in the passage or nonpassage of legislation, and in the administration of the laws.

It has been one of my great pleasures in Washington to be able to work very closely with many of these organizations. Currently, it is my privilege to serve as the chairman of the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, an association of 41 national organizations, with chief interest in the disadvantaged rural American.

Among the 41 organizations are some ten Protestant, three Jewish, and six Roman Catholic groups; the AFL-CIO; the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO; four international unions, members of the AFL-CIO; the National Farmers Union; the National Consumers League; the NAACP; and many others.

This voluntary association of all these national organizations is brought about by our common interest in the problems of chronic poverty and discrimination in rural America. That means we're interested in sharecroppers and tenants; we're interested in migratory workers; we're interested in depressed rural areas; we're interested in every legislative proposal or executive action which promises to bring some help to these disadvantaged people.

I would like to convince you of the **value** of this kind of voluntary activity, to encourage you to organize such voluntary activities.

You know that the powerful industries and labor unions in the United States, the professions, and other special interests are well organized; that they're well financed; that they're well represented in Washington. They have adequate budgets; they have research staffs; they have legislative representatives — or lobbyists or whatever else they want to call them. They have the know-how to deal with Congress and Executive Departments. They are working at the job all the time.

On the other hand, the poor, the disadvantaged, the unorganized have no voice of their own. They have no organized political power of their own. They have no dollars to contribute to political campaigns.

Therefore, unless voluntary citizen organizations, particularly those that are of religious inspiration, act as the voice and as the conscience of the American citizens in regard to these people and these problems, they will never be given attention and will never get favorable action.

The efforts of people like ourselves, the efforts of the member organizations of the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, are not resented in Washington. They are welcomed. Legislators and administrators whose desks are daily pounded and whose ears are daily assaulted by the demands of powerful well-organized groups with special and often selfish interests to pursue get tired of all that. They welcome a voice for morality; they welcome a voice of advice and assistance on what must be done out of moral principle for the common welfare and for the welfare of disadvantaged citizens.

If I can say so without revealing any political partisanship, there is a climate, particularly today, in Washington which welcomes this kind of representation.

We are actively engaged, many of us, in direct and indirect contact with Congress and with the Executive Department; we make strenuous efforts within our legal and other limitations and within our budgets to influence legislation. It's a pleasure to be able to report that this year we achieved a significant victory. That was on Public Law 78, the Bracero program.

The victory is rightly being attributed to the activities of the church groups and other voluntary agencies in Washington and around the country. I think justice demands, however, that the activities and effective influence of organized labor should also be recognized.

At any rate the fact is that after years of struggle we have this major victory to report -- a victory, to be sure, which is not yet nailed down, but which is going to require strenuous and coordinated effort for the rest of this session of Congress before we can be sure that it's a final victory.

But this is only one part of the over-all problem. This was only removing a negative influence on the U.S. citizens who are in the migratory labor force. There is a need for all kinds of positive and constructive legislation directed to the needs of our own citizens. There is need for keeping up and making more effective all of these various existing government programs such as John Baker illustrated this morning. There's a big job still to be done, as is perfectly evident to all of us.

I'd like to end my comments by saying: I don't think that the American citizen, generally speaking, realizes the potential power he holds in his hand, and I mean literally in his hand, which he does not exercise. I speak of voting. It's true that many of us feel a sense of futility when it comes to the individual vote. We know in a general election there are hundreds of thousands or tens of millions of people voting, and we feel that our one vote is really insignificant.

But I assure you that there is yet another channel involving the use of his hands available to the citizen, and that is the letter to his Congressmen. This is very direct and very effective.

If the American citizens who are concerned with the issues about which we're concerned here would make themselves sufficiently knowledgeable about the issues to be able to write intelligent and articulate letters, if they would take the time to exercise the little bit of energy required to write a letter to Congressmen and to demand a satisfactory answer, you have no idea what could be done to achieve the objectives we all agree on.

I have known of cases where a mere handful of people could swing the balance on important issues, where a couple hundred letters as the expressions of concerned and knowledgeable American citizens could have profound influence on the outcome of important legislation.

So if there's no other message that I could convey to you from Washington the one message would be: REALIZE THE POWER THAT YOU AND PEOPLE LIKE YOU HOLD LITERALLY IN YOUR HANDS, AND EXERCISE IT!

Panel Discussion . . .

HOW INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES MEET THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

SCHOOLS

MISS LOIS M. CLARK
National Education Association
Department of Rural Education
Washington, D.C.

In considering this topic I was reminded of a story, purportedly from the Ozarks, concerning a young chap with only a minimum of schooling who decided to strike out for the city. When he got on the main highway he saw road signs. But his limited ability to read placed him in the dilemma of knowing "how far, but not where to." Educational institutions face some such dilemma, though they must ask, not only "Where to?" but also, "What is the best way to get there?"

Almost from the beginning of public education in this country we have been adding to the curriculum of the schools. Recently, the demands to add new elements have come very rapidly. As a consequence, a common plea from the teacher is, "If you add one thing more, what are you going to take away?" The problem, as I see it, is no longer one of what to add and what to take away; rather, a completely different orientation to the problem of what to teach is required.

For a long time we have acted on the assumption that our society is sufficiently static, that we have met the need if we hand on to the next generation the knowledge that has been useful to us in fitting into our world. But we are now in a period when knowledge — that which is available to be known — is multiplying so rapidly that it is necessary not only to educate about the past, we also have to educate about what was learned only yesterday, so to speak.

The question now is: How can we deal with the more and more that it is possible to know, within the time limits set by the human life span? And how can we equip ourselves and those that come after us to meet problems we do not now know and cannot anticipate? These questions face us as we undertake to determine priorities for education today.

Some answers to these and related questions are being developed. I shall mention only two or three of them.

The first — one to which a great deal of thought, a great deal of study, on the part of a great many people has been given — is this: Can we identify a central core or principle around which expanding knowledge may be organized for learning? What principles can we discover or develop which will give those we teach some guides for coping with situations they will face in the future — situations we cannot anticipate? The key in answering these questions, we now believe, lies in recognition of the role played by the rational mind, both in bringing our society to its present stage of development and in solving the problems which arise from this development.

This morning Dr. Baker referred to the need, at times, to keep working at and around a complex problem until one's intelligence finds a place to take hold. This is the point I want to make. We realize that the rapidly accelerating developments in technology and science have resulted from man's use of his rational mind. Using it, he has "created" or set in motion these developments. If what he has set in motion is not to turn into a destructive monster, man must also use his rational mind to learn how to live in this environment he has helped to create.

We cannot today give youth answers they will need next week, next year, or ten years from now. What, then, can we give them? We must give them the tools with which they can find their own answers. And these tools, we are beginning to see, are open and creative minds, skill in using the rational powers of their minds, freedom from too great inhibition by fears, and responsiveness to what has been without being too much inhibited by it.

To develop such abilities takes a very different kind of teaching than expecting children to study their textbooks and to give back the "right" answers. And it's this teaching for answers that is going on, even yet, to a greater degree than we like to believe.

Another aspect of the situation seems significant. In selecting the material we will use to help children understand significant developments in the world, and so using it that they gain the capacity to use their minds on new problems as these arise, we face a number of further problems. One of these relates to the contributions to be made by the various scholarly fields.

In working on the broad problem of what and how to teach, through a special project of the National Education Association, scholars representing various fields of study — the scientist, the historian, the mathematician, the artist, and so on — were asked to respond, in a special seminar, to the question: "What do you believe is significant in your field of study, in terms of both the essential knowledge and the distinctive method of thinking, which ought to be a part of the general education of every student?" Some of the scholars were well along in their efforts to answer these questions. Some of them were just beginning to explore the question. Answers are not immediately available. But educators realize, as never before, that the question of **what** to teach, **when**, can be answered only by pooling the results of these scholarly efforts with what is now known about child development and the nature of learning.

One more dimension of this needs to be discussed, that of values. Let me illustrate this by returning to the seminar of scholars. They had arrived at the concept of "the autonomy of the intellect" as the key in determining how to educate for ability to solve problems, to meet new situations. But they were reminded by the historian in the group that: "We must not forget that these people are not only learning in order to solve their problems, at the same time each will be living a life. We want these to be rewarding lives." And so we do. In recognizing the role of the rational mind, we would not substitute "intellect" for "values"; rather we would learn to consider, with our rational minds, the values which relate to the total "good life" we hope for.

All kinds of problems can enter here. But again, there are guidelines. Some things are constant for everybody. The need for each of us to "pull our weight" as effective citizens. The right of the individual to have opportunity to develop his own individual capacities. These "needs" or "rights" and responsibilities exist whether the child lives in the most isolated spot, in comfortable suburbia, in the city depths, or elsewhere.

But there are some variables in the picture, variables which relate to the situation in which the child lives and learns. One of our problems, a very real one, with which we are having some development but not nearly enough, has to do with use of the resources for learning which are distinctive in the environment of rural boys and girls.

We have been very much preoccupied over a period of years with problems of school and district organization. This seemed an essential step in making possible rich and varied programs of education in rural areas. But increasingly, with this problem under control, we are looking at the world around us, and at the possibilities of using its resources as an important part of the "stuff" of education in rural areas. In other words, one of the variables inheres in the rich resources of the world of nature which are most accessible in rural areas, resources which can be lost if we do not learn to value them through using them in teaching. This seems especially a responsibility in rural education.

A film which I saw recently pictured a farm that had been located in what is now St. Louis, Missouri. Scenes in it reminded me of the time when, at the age of ten or twelve, I happened onto an Indian Pipe in the woods where we frequently played. The wonder and delight that it evoked is something I have never forgotten. It had a value that was not less real because it was intangible, impossible to measure.

I have given, all too briefly, some of the dimensions of the education needed. Let me also indicate, even more briefly, what it is not. When people in respected positions talk about "getting tough" and having children do more homework, we need to remember that piling on more of what they have already mastered, and expecting children to learn more and more for the purpose of reciting it, is NOT the kind of education needed now and in the future. And for the disadvantaged in town and country, the need is especially great for education which extends and enriches, opening up capacities that have never had opportunity to come to light. Schools are seeking to further such developments as these, as important means of meeting their responsibilities in an increasingly complex world.

THE CHURCH

REV. E. W. MUELLER
Church in Town and Country
National Lutheran Council
Chicago, Illinois

Every person, regardless of where he lives or who he is, should have access to a meaningful ministry to help him cope with the daily activities of life and face confidently the realities of death. This means that the Church should maintain an adequate and a meaningful ministry in every community. If this is to be done the Church must creatively deal with the problem of overchurching as it exists in many of the depressed areas. To do this is difficult since we are not writing on a clean slate. Because of the many church units in these depressed areas congregations find it difficult to provide adequate facilities, an adequate ministry, and a meaningful worship service. Protestant church groups are seeking to solve this problem.

More particularly I want to speak about the fruits of a meaningful worship service.

1. The Church must help people deal constructively with change. It is important that people understand the origin of changes. They are the result of choices that people make. They come about when people are given the opportunity for alternate ways of doing things. A person makes a responsible choice when he gives due consideration to the interests of others and to the general well-being of the community. The Church can demand of its members that they make responsible choices.

The Church can also encourage people to rise above self-centeredness. There is a tendency for people to be self-centered in their choices and this adds to the burden of the disadvantaged.

The Prodigal Son had a choice to make: Should he stay at home or should he leave home. He chose to leave. This was not bad. What was bad was his motive for leaving. It was self-centered. He thought only of himself. This led to a lot of foolish living and it meant a dead-end street for him.

Sometimes rugged individualism, which we tend to praise, comes very close to self-centeredness. It may lead our society into a dead-end street.

In making responsible choices self-interest must be balanced with community concern. The Church can help people have a balanced concern, a concern for the individual and a concern for the community.

2. The Church can help to develop a positive attitude that human needs be met. The needs have been identified at this conference. It is God's Will that these be met. He has provided us with the know-how and with the resources. It is a matter of developing more adequate social patterns and social structures so that unmet needs and resources can be brought together. The place to begin is to develop an attitude that unmet needs can be met. It is not God's Will that there be disadvantaged people. Human progress is the result of man's struggle to meet more adequately human needs. The Church can support people in this struggle.

3. The Church can emphasize that each individual has worth. The worth of an individual is not determined by his productivity; the worth of an individual is not determined by his education; the worth of an individual is not determined by family background or geographical location. **That which gives the individual worth is found in his creation.** Each individual is a thought of Almighty God; each individual has the same worth!

To be realistic, however, all people are not created with the same capacity, the same talents, the same abilities. But that does not mean that they have less worth. The Church can do well to emphasize that man derives his worth from his creation.

4. The Church can help develop an awareness of the unmet needs that exist. The least the Church can do is to speak up for those who are being bypassed or are being neglected. The Church may not always know what to do, but the least it can do is to speak up and identify the needs and the problems.

It is not required that every generation find a complete answer. It is required that we try and that we move in the direction in which the answer lies. This needs to be done in the local community and by the local congregation. It is not difficult for a person to identify the unmet needs in a general way

or in someone else's back yard, but each congregation must identify the unmet needs in its community here and now. As these are identified we are being pointed to places where God's Will is being thwarted.

The voice of concern must also be heard in the policy-making groups. Often the things that shape the future of a rural community or that affect the future of the disadvantaged is decided in a city far away — in a group that meets somewhere else. It is important that the Church's voice be heard in such policy-making groups. Concerned laymen can speak up for the disadvantaged at state and national levels in the structures and organizations to which they belong!

5. The Church can foster a spirit of interdependence among people. God created people for each other. He did not create people that they might exploit each other. He created people that they might help each other find fulfillment.

An overemphasis on personal individualism tends to destroy this interrelatedness. We need to emphasize the interrelatedness that exists between the groups in a community and the various sectors of the nation's population. This is the encouraging thing we see in the rural areas development approach. It is an organized effort to marshal the resources of different groups in a given community to help people achieve their goals. People are helped to see their interdependence and that individual and group efforts must complement each other to achieve the goals that people set.

This interrelatedness that is being articulated through the community resources development emphasis must also find expression in the different population sectors and interest groups that make up our nation. This means that the Church needs to help develop a deeper sense of what it means to be a nation. Just to have a mass of people organize for secular purposes is not a nation. We need to develop a deeper sense of what it means to be a nation. It will not do to have interest groups working against each other. These various interests must accept the responsibility of helping each other find fulfillment.

6. The Church can work for wholeness. Many ingredients make up our national life — the economic aspect, the psychological factor, the role of education, the place of moral values. The importance of these ingredients needs to be emphasized. When we emphasize them separately and give them significance in themselves it creates divisiveness. All of these must be brought under the judgment of God so that they relate to ultimate goals. When any one of them is emphasized out of proportion we get divisiveness instead of wholeness.

The Church through its various ministries can create wholeness by bringing these things under the judgment of God.

7. The Church must not hesitate to point out the sins of society. The Church is quick to condemn such things as rape and biological exploitation, but economical exploitation of people is equally as wrong. The sins of neglect of an affluent society may injure the disadvantaged. We may fail to provide economic protection, educational opportunity, or equal access to employment.

8. Finally, the Church can show compassion. It does this by having a deep, genuine concern for people, and by having respect for the people it is trying to help. It must not violate their personalities, be they ever so humble or be they ever so dispossessed. We must respect their personalities and allow them the right to refuse help. Even though people have the right to refuse

help the advantaged must continue to offer help. The strong always have the responsibility to offer help but a person always has the right of choice. He has the right to accept or the right to refuse help because he is a human being. This is what makes man "man." He can choose to accept; he can choose not to accept.

But the Church must continue to show a deep sense of compassion — a willingness to go the second mile. This will take real tough doing. It will take genuine Christian motivation.

If we look at the disadvantaged from the standpoint of secular society we tend to be motivated by what lies in front of us — the people in depressed areas. If we look at it from the Christian standpoint the source of our motivation will not be what lies in front of us — the disadvantaged people — but rather what lies behind us — God's love as revealed on the Cross!

Saint Paul in his journeys was not motivated by the unchurched people in Asia Minor; he was motivated by the fact that on his way to Damascus he had been confronted by the Christ in a very dramatic way. It was the motivation for his productive life! The same motivation will help us go the second mile. The disadvantaged people are an opportunity to give expression to our concern.

GIRL SCOUTS

MISS NANCY CAMPBELL
National Field Staff, Girl Scouts of the USA
Atlanta, Georgia

The year 1962 marked the Fiftieth Anniversary of Girl Scouting in the United States of America. Since its beginning in 1912, the Girl Scout organization has emphasized its abiding interest in reaching all girls who want to belong to the movement. Juliette Gordon Low, Founder of the Girl Scouts, expressed in the Promise and Laws a philosophy of service and sisterhood. The Preamble to the Girl Scout Constitution states: "We affirm that the Girl Scout movement shall ever be open to all girls and adults who accept the Girl Scout Promise and Laws."

From twelve girls and two adults in 1912 to a membership of over three million today is phenominal growth. We are proud of the fact that the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., with their sister Scouts and Guides in 67 other countries, form the largest organization for girls in the free world. In the five decades past, many things have happened to our country — world wars, depressions, changes in social patterns. The Girl Scout organization has always felt the obligation to respond to these changes, not only creatively but also responsibly, to act both with imagination and with care.

No growing organization or program can remain unchanged while the world around it changes with ever-increasing speed. So that girls of the 60's could have a Scouting program designed for the 60's, the National Girl Scout Organization sponsored a major research project on the needs and interests of adolescent girls, and followed this with a study of the Girl Scout program itself, to determine how well it was meeting the needs and interests of the girls of today. Both studies were conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

These studies reaffirmed the fact that the fundamentals of Scouting are true and right. The impact of these fundamentals on growing girls is great and they will not change. But we are sharpening the content of the entire program to keep it current with the needs and interests of girls in the 60's. In 1912 Girl Scouts learned to stop a runaway horse, in 1963 they learn another kind of traffic safety.

The week of September 9, 1963, will be a milestone in our history for during that week Girl Scouts across the United States will begin using four new Girl Scout Handbooks. At that time there will be one Girl Scout program with four age level adaptations, for girls 7 through 17, built upon a foundation of six elements — the Promise and Laws, service, troop management, citizenship, international friendship, and health and safety. These elements permeate activities related to the arts, the home, and the out-of-doors, and are carried out in troops and camps.

During the Fiftieth Anniversary we have been hard at work revitalizing our program and organizing and strengthening local Girl Scout Councils. "Council Coverage" is a plan to cover every square mile of the United States of America with strong Girl Scout Councils, touching border to border and each having within its own jurisdiction the personnel, finances, and access to community resources to provide every girl who wants it a dynamic and expanding Girl Scout program. In 1946, prior to the launching of the Coverage Plan, there were approximately 12,000 communities in the country where Girl Scouting did not exist at all and 14% of all troops were "lone troops" that did not have the benefits of council guidance. Today approximately 90% of the girl membership is in councils which have completed Council Coverage and only 1% of the total girl membership remains in "lone troops."

With a program designed to meet the needs and interests of girls in the 60's, and with strong, effective councils covering every area of the United States, we feel that we have the means to fulfill our obligation to serve all girls 7 through 17 who wish to be members of the Girl Scout movement.

During this conference we have talked about the disadvantaged in town and country society. In Girl Scouting we use the term "hard-to-reach" to identify those girls or groups of girls who do not seek out Girl Scouting and who are not reached by the usual troop organization methods. Whether we called them disadvantaged or hard-to-reach, I believe in many instances we are talking about the same people. They might be: **Newcomers** — Children of defense, construction, and migrating agricultural workers or military personnel; residents of another state or nonresidents of any state; nationals of another country or recently naturalized citizens. **Members of Minority Groups** — Children of cultural, racial, religious minority groups, or groups that have minority status even if they are in the majority. **Economically Handicapped** — Children either temporarily or permanently handicapped by their parents' low income.

Children whose parents are within any one of these groups share with them possible social handicaps, employment limitations and job insecurity, housing restrictions, increased health hazards, language difficulties.

How are the Girl Scouts striving to meet their responsibilities to serve the disadvantaged or hard-to-reach?

Recognizing that much needs to be done in this area, one of the current goals of our organization is to "broaden the reach of Girl Scouting to include a better cross section of the population." In adopting this goal, both the national organization and all local councils have pledged themselves to make this a priority.

Pilot projects carried out by the National Girl Scout Organization have not only made available Girl Scouting to many disadvantaged girls but the findings of these demonstration projects are now available to guide councils throughout the country as they work in hard-to-reach areas.

One project, three years in length, involved rural migrant families in the San Joaquin Valley of California. Another project, two years in duration, took place in the Los Angeles area and was designed to extend Girl Scouting to the disadvantaged living in urban situations. The learning from these two projects mentioned above is now available to local councils throughout the country in the form of a filmstrip entitled, "Reaching More Girls," and a guide called, "Broadening Our Reach."

Many local councils have experimented with projects of their own in metropolitan areas such as Seattle, Kansas City, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Atlanta, and others. Since 1950 the Girl Scout Council of Greater New York has been conducting a program to offer Girl Scouting to the culturally deprived in the Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, and annually has published a report of their work in this field.

Through Girl Scouting, Indian girls gain concepts of citizenship, respect for the democratic process, and moral and spiritual values. In training courses for Girl Scout leaders, given in Indian schools in Oklahoma and New Mexico, through work with the Navajo tribal council to stress adult-youth partnership in community activities, and in providing ways for Cherokee girls to share their camping skills with others, the Girl Scouts are making an effort to offer American Indian girls a chance to learn new things and to relearn many old things their parents have forgotten.

Here in the South, many of our councils have taken great strides forward in extending membership and camping opportunities for Negro girls. More and more councils are seeking top Negro leadership to serve in positions of responsibility on boards of directors and council committees.

Recently a special project director has been employed to work towards bringing great scouting opportunities to girls living in 52 rural counties in parts of Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia.

These are some of the ways in which the Girl Scouts are striving to meet their obligations to girls 7 through 17. We recognize that there is much which remains to be done and that we are only one of many organizations that has a concern for the Disadvantaged in Town and Country Society. We welcome the opportunity of working with an organization such as the American Country Life Association, as together we seek to bring about a happier and more humane life for all.

BOY SCOUTS

EDGAR W. WOLFE
Rural Relationships Service, Boy Scouts of America,
New Brunswick, New Jersey

The interest of national youth groups in serving unreached rural children goes back many years. It is safe to say that the results of their efforts has

had a great impact, and that the problems of disadvantaged rural youth would be far greater today had it not been for the continuous and productive work of these volunteer organizations. Today, all of the national youth agencies are keenly aware of the challenge imposed in the hard-to-reach areas.

The extent to which these agencies have met their responsibilities is sometimes not fully appreciated by the general public or even the community leaders. The Boy Scouts of America, for example, has been chartered by the federal government to work cooperatively with all agencies and institutions to make the scouting program available to all boys. To do this, we have established 530 local councils, each with specific territorial assignments. These councils have the primary responsibility of extending the program to boys in their territory by developing close working relationships with institutions and other agencies. The partnership of local institutions with the national youth movement enables every community to provide its boys with the same program available to any other community. Even the most underdeveloped area of the nation has this program available and, in addition, has professionally-trained leadership available.

Local institutions, churches, schools, civic organizations, parents' groups, fraternal groups, all have the capacity to render a community service to youth. They have facilities for meetings, thus eliminating the need for constructing special buildings; they have some of the best manpower available in the community. They have access to parents, as well as boys. The Boy Scouts of America has made its program available to these institutions without cost and assumes the responsibility of training the volunteer leaders selected by the institution, providing them with leadership and program helps, makes available a Boy Scout camp in the immediate area for the year-round use of the institution and its boys, and provides a monthly on-the-spot service call to the adult leader in charge of the group. In those communities which are long on boys and short on institutions or manpower, flexible patterns of organization have been used for many years which enable small groups or isolated boys to have the benefits of the scouting program.

We have conducted research to determine areas of need. As a result of this, we are currently making a study of the reaching power of scouting among the boy population in each of our 3,000 districts. We have prepared scout materials in Spanish in order to serve more effectively our boys of Latin American background. We are making the Boy Scout Handbook and **Boys' Life** available in Braille.

We have conducted pilot projects with migrants. We have had a cooperative program with over 30 Indian tribal councils.

We have worked closely with the Council of Southern Mountains, with the mission programs of the various religious institutions, and have taken an active part in the Federal Rural Areas Development program.

In spite of the efforts of all volunteer youth agencies, the need for continued and stepped-up effort and cooperation between youth agencies, local communities and institutions, is forcefully underlined by the fact that approximately 45% of all rural boys, and I presume a nearly similar figure for girls, belong to no youth organization or group. This requires continued effort by all youth organizations and increased cooperation and understanding by local community leaders and local institutions.

HIGHER EDUCATION

ROY C. BUCK

Center for Continuing Liberal Education
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

My remarks shall be limited to higher education in schools and colleges of agriculture. In many instances undergraduate education in agriculture has moved from the center of the land-grant university to the periphery. Enrollments are declining and many of the traditional departments or majors are on the verge of going out of undergraduate education.

At the same time enrollment in Arts and Science curricula increases and the idea of a liberal education, well-larded with science, seems to be a central emphasis in undergraduate courses of study.

Vested interests in higher education in agriculture respond to these trends in two major ways:

1. Agricultural curricula are being dressed up with increased science, arts, and humanity requirements and electives.

2. Agricultural industry is being wooed as never before in attempts to hold the demand for agricultural graduates at a higher level. Indeed some colleges of agriculture have gone so far as to pledge themselves to produce the kind of graduates industry wants.

Thus, in colleges and schools of agriculture all over the country we find a new sensitivity, and at times a sense of drift. Major energy seems to be directed toward holding on to traditional forms of higher education in agriculture, or at the most only minimum adjustment. This is not altogether unexpected for university campuses are not likely to be centers of quick adjustment to social and cultural change. The academic emphasis tends to foster a resistance to change, to extol the "great" traditions, and to foster the "island" motif as the role of the university in a sea of relative values.

This condition exists at a time when we are told that the demand for college-trained young people in the various agricultural industries is greater than ever before. The problem seems to be that the college of agriculture graduate is in competition with those from at least two or three other colleges for the sales trainee or executive training position. The special claim that agricultural college graduates had on many positions is reduced and in many cases gone.

It may be that the college of agriculture, so far as undergraduate education is concerned, will find its new mission as a liberalizing force in the life of the university. My guess is that there will continue to be a demand for the agriculturalist. This is a person having competency in chemistry, accounting, engineering, or journalism; but in addition feels a strong commitment to the agricultural industry as the means by which he will earn his livelihood and make a contribution to society.

Agricultural colleges in their urge to hold on may very well throw the baby out with the bath! In an effort to appear like all the other colleges, the ideology and sentiment associated with agriculture may be allowed to deterio

rate into an irrelevant anachronism. Agricultural college officials often appear not to understand the truth behind one of the most sacred agricultural proverbs: "Man cannot live by bread alone." An undergraduate curriculum that pays attention only to the production of bread loses its identity among the mass of other courses and curricula. Technical knowledge alone does not make an agriculturalist. Technical knowledge in a climate of concern for things agricultural will produce the responsible fertilizer salesmen or the farm machinery executive.

What about extension education in agriculture? We need to be considering ways for people to experience an accumulative effect by being in extension programs from childhood through old age. It can be a little like Sunday School, where 40 years of regular attendance may not leave much in the way of a mark other than a string of gold bars on a coat lapel. Advanced programs of education for adults are not numerous. There is not much evidence of innovation in education for rural people who have significantly achieved the goals of efficient production and use of time. We need some real "meaty graduate study" programs for these select few, for these leaders we point to with pride.

In a word, I would claim that the best days of higher education in agriculture are ahead of us. We need to divest ourselves of a few "sacred cows" and rededicate ourselves to a new reason for being. In doing this we shall once again experience the satisfaction of those early leaders in agricultural education when they first spread the mysteries of livestock and crop improvement before their students. But we shall have to first map out what the new agriculture will be. Toward what do we want to move? Answers to this question will take a lot more time than is allotted to this panel or to this meeting. This is the continuing question for us all.

CITATION TO ALLAN B. KLINE

In behalf of the American Country Life Association, this citation is awarded to Allan B. Kline, past president of The American Farm Bureau Federation. His wise leadership and counsel in the varied and complex economy of this nation stands as a model of the proper relationship between public and private interests in a free society. The American Country Life Association is proud to salute Allan B. Kline.

Allan B. Kline was born in 1895 in Dixon County, Nebraska. He received a B.A. degree from Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, in 1915, and later a B.S. degree from Iowa State College. He holds honorary doctor's degrees from three Iowa colleges, including his two alma maters.

As President of the American Farm Bureau Federation from 1947 to 1954, Mr. Kline was spokesman for the nation's largest farm organization. His work of representing the Farm Bureau in Washington required not only a mastery of the technicalities of farm legislation but also an application of hard common sense to the affairs of the nation. While he favored high prices for farm commodities, he did not wish high prices to be achieved at the expense of controls that would limit the farmer's opportunity or independence. During his tenure of office he spent much of his time traveling about the rural areas of America to become better acquainted with the farmer's needs and wants. He filled his role as head of the Farm Bureau with distinction not only because of his ability to speak forcefully and act purposefully but also because of his willingness to listen.

He was eminently qualified for his position of President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, having been a farm operator in Iowa until 1944 and

having served as President of the Benton County, Iowa, Farm Bureau for ten years and as President of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation from 1943 to 1947.

Because of his thorough-going knowledge of agricultural problems and issues, Mr. Kline has frequently been called upon for advice and counsel. He was adviser to the United States delegation, Ninth Session of the Conference of FAO, Rome, 1947; consultant, special committee of the United States Senate on economic and military support to Yugoslavia, 1957; and adviser, United States delegation GAAT negotiations, Geneva, 1955. He made numerous trips to the Common Market during the late 1910's as consultant to USDA in the interest of expanding markets. He attended the East Asian Rural Reconstruction Conference at Tokyo, in the fall of 1955.

He received the United States Chamber of Commerce Great Living Americans Award in 1958. He was President of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers from 1953 to 1955.

He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Assembly; member of the National 4-H Service Committee; member of the Board of Trustees of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship; member of the United States section of the Mexico-United States Chamber of Commerce Joint Committee; chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Farm Foundation; and a member of the Board of Directors of the Institute of American Strategy.

He is a former member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago and the Advisory Committee to the Export-Import Bank, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Kline's contributions in the formulation of national farm policy and his other services to agriculture have made him a true agricultural statesman.

CITATION TO ROBERT V. MULLEN

The American Country Life Association is pleased to cite for Distinguished Service to Rural Life, Robert V. Mullen, Executive Director of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation. For his own great contribution of personal interest and wise counsel, and for the great services rendered by the Foundation and the Company which he represents, we wish in this manner to express our profoundest gratitude.

Robert V. Mullen was born on March 6, 1916, Kansas City, and received his college training at the University of North Carolina and the University of Notre Dame, from which institution he was graduated magna cum laude in 1938. Except for a period of three years when he served his country in the military forces, he has spent his entire working life with the Company and Foundation which he now serves.

Much of that time has been spent carrying out the many programs sponsored by Sears Roebuck for the benefit of the youth of America, and especially those who were reared in our rural communities. He has administered the Sears Foundation scholarship program as well as the the cooperative programs undertaken with 4-H, vocational agriculture, and soil conservation leaders. In recent years he has administered the impressive Community Service Contest carried out with the National Grange, as well as the Community Improvement Program carried out with the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Both these community programs have been widely acclaimed and have had a profound influence in preserving self-reliance and creativity in the communities of the nation.

Among the national honors which have come to Mr. Mullen are the American Farmer Degree given by the Future Farmers of America, and the National 4-H Citation given by the National 4-H Camp. Recently he received the distinction of being the first honorary life member of The Distributive Educational Clubs of America. Mr. Mullen is now serving as vice chairman of the National Farm-City Committee and is a member of the Rural Service Commission of the Boy Scouts of America. He holds the Seventh Degree in the National Grange.

Mr. Mullen's deep interest in the work of the American Country Life Association has been expressed in many ways. He has a broad knowledge of the perplexing problems which face leaders of rural life today and has been most generous with his time and his counsel in launching a broad attack on these problems.

This citation is an expression of the respect and gratitude of the members of this Association.

MINUTES — ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the American Country Life Association, Inc. was called to order by President Robert T. Frerichs, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina, College Union Theater, July 10, 1963, 8:30 A.M.

The President asked Secretary Mueller to read the minutes of the July 11, 1962, meeting.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the minutes as read.

In connection with his report the Treasurer reminded the Association members that the favorable economic standing was due to the $1500 grant received from Sears Roebuck Foundation.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the Treasurer's report as presented. (See Exhibit A.)

IT WAS VOTED to express to Sears Roebuck Foundation appreciation for the $1500 grant.

The Secretary reviewed activities of his office for the past year — correspondence relating to general items, memberships, proceedings, proceeding orders, program, and the 1963 annual meeting. He reported that the membership as of June 30, 1963, was 105 individuals and 17 organizations.

Mr. Frerichs read the report prepared by Dr. A. F. Wileden concerning relationships with the Agency for International Development. The report is attached as Exhibit B.

Mr. Milo Swanton, chairman, spoke to the annual meeting on the developments relative to a presidential commission on country life. His report is attached as Exhibit C.

Mr. Swanton also presented a resolution drawn up by him at the request of the Board of Directors. See Exhibit D.

IT WAS VOTED to adopt the resolution as presented and to transmit it to the proper persons in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Glenn Fox, chairman of the Nominating Committee, recommended the following persons for a three-year term on the Board of Directors: Dr. Arthur Floyd, Sr., Dr. R. J. Hildreth, Rev. Serge Hummon, Miss Gertrude Humphreys, Mr. Jack Jackson, Mr. J. Kenneth Stern, Mr. Jerry Voorhis.

IT WAS VOTED that the report of the Nominating Committee be accepted as presented and that the Secretary be asked to cast a unanimous ballot.

The Resolutions Committee, Miss Gertrude Humphreys, chairman, presented the following resolutions:

Whereas, the 1963 annual conference of the American Country Life Association, Inc. proved to be of unusual interest, benefit, and inspiration as a result of the fine cooperation of the staff of the host institution with those who planned and participated in the conference program, be it

Resolved, that the officers, members, and others attending the annual meeting of the American Country Life Association wish to express their sincere thanks and appreciation to Dr. H. Brooks James, Dean of Agriculture, North Carolina State College, to Dr. C. E. Bishop, to the local arrangements committee, including Dr. Selz C. Mayo, Thomas Hobgood, and James Young, and to other

members of the North Carolina State College staff who contributed in so many ways to the success of the conference.

Resolved, further, that this group deeply appreciates the excellent conference rooms, accommodations, and services made available by North Carolina State College. Special appreciation is expressed for the provision of integrated facilities, and for the news coverage and promotional work of the local committee on arrangements.

Also, members of the conference acknowledge gratefully the cooperation and support of the other institutions, organizations, and groups whose personnel gave freely of their time and talents as speakers and participants in the conference program.

IT WAS VOTED that the resolutions be accepted and that copies of the resolutions be sent to the proper personnel.

President Frerichs reported that the next annual conference would be held at the National 4-H Club Center, Washington, D.C., on July 7-8, 1964.

He stated that the possible theme would be "Recreation for economic and personal growth in country living."

IT WAS VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,
E. W. Mueller, Secretary

Exhibit A

TREASURER'S REPORT — DECEMBER 31, 1962

Balance on hand January 1, 1962			$1,457.09
Receipts:			
Memberships — 101 ind. @ $ 5.00	$505.00		
14 org. @ $25.00	350.00	$ 855.00	
Proceedings sold		$ 74.08	
Refund — overpayment of bill		10.00	
Annual meeting			
banquet tickets — 51 @ $3.50	$178.50		
registrations — 44 @ $2; 13 @ $1	101.00	279.50	1,218.58
Reimbursement of cash advanced for annual meeting			50.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS			$2,725.67
Expenditures:			
500 letter envelopes — Gates			$ 6.31
1500 letter envelopes — Mueller			13.68
250 letter envelopes — Frerichs			5.48
National Education Association, 1960-61 expenses			101.21
Stamps			99.00
Multilithing, NLC			199.45
Letterhead plate and printing			11.20
Program plate and typesetting			13.60
Delivery charges			2.50
Telephone calls			5.17
Supplies and postage at NLC			24.59
I. Herrboldt — secretarial services 6/30/61 to 7/1/62			392.60

Annual Meeting Expenses:		
53 Banquet Tickets	$ 185.50	
Flowers for Banquet	11.00	
Miscellaneous	1.25	
I. Herrboldt, travel, etc.	102.48	300.23
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		$1,175.02
Cash Advanced for Annual Meeting		50.00
		$1,225.02
Balance 12/31/62		1,500.65
		$2,725.67

TREASURER'S REPORT — JUNE 30, 1963

Balance on hand January 1, 1963			$1,500.65
Receipts:			
Memberships — 92 ind. @ $ 5.00	$460.00		
1 ind. @ $ 8.00	8.00		
17 org. @ $25.00	425.00	$ 893.00	
Proceedings sold		428.60	
Reprints of individual papers sold		775.67	
Sears Roebuck Foundation grant		1,500.00	
1963 Receipts			$3,597.27
TOTAL RECEIPTS			$5,097.92
Expenditures:			
Stamps			$ 175.00
Freight charges on proceedings			7.48
1,000 Proceedings, 1961			716.95
1,000 Proceedings, 1962			1,059.98
Reprints of individual papers, 1962 proceedings			711.38
5,000 Flyers			125.00
Multilithing, Acme Copy Corp., 1,500 invitations			50.70
Varityping, invitations and program			8.00
1,500 Envelopes — Mueller			13.68
National Lutheran Council:			
Multilithing, 7/1/62 to 6/6/63	$ 84.58		
Telephone calls	13.33		
Supplies and postage	39.98		
Delivery charges to Post Office	8.50	146.39	
Irma Herrboldt:			
Secretarial services, 7/1/62 to 6/22/63, 224½ hours	$642.07		
Supplies purchased	4.44	646.51	
Department of State (New York)		12.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES			$3,673.07
Balance 6/30/63			1,424.85
			$5,097.92

Exhibit B

REPORT OF THE AGREEMENT WITH THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The cooperative relationship between the International Cooperation Administration, first worked out in 1956, has been a very modest one as summarized on pp. 93-94 of the 1961 Proceedings. During the period from 1956 to 1961 eleven foreign nationals had applied for and had been accepted into the membership of the Association. A total of $129 had been received in membership dues from these individuals who represented eight different foreign countries.

At the November 30, 1961, meeting of the Board of Directors the cooperative relationship with the Agency for International Development, the successor to the International Cooperation Administration, was reviewed. It was voted that President Aubrey Gates be authorized to write Fowler Hamilton, then in charge of AID, reviewing the relationship up to that time and assuring them of our continued desire to cooperate. Since that time only one additional referral has been received. This was from: Dhiresh Kumar Paul

1312 Wilson Avenue
Columbia, Missouri

His payment of $15 for a three-year membership in ACLA is being turned over to our secretary-treasurer herewith. He should be provided with membership card, copies of proceedings, and other pertinent materials. I have sent him a program and invitation to this meeting.

However, since 1961 there have been two modifications of the cooperative arrangement with AID. One is for AID to pay all the membership for these trainees while in this country, as for D. K. Paul, instead of part of the membership as previously. The other was a suggestion for the ACLA to consider extending a two-year courtesy membership to former trainee-members after they return to their home country.

This suggestion was acted upon at the July 9-10, 1962, meetings of the Association as reported on p. 121 of the 1962 Proceedings. However, it was voted to extend to them this two-year courtesy membership only following inquiry by your liaison representative as to their desire to continue such membership.

Personal letters were accordingly written, on November 28, 1962, to each of our eleven trainee-members who had presumably returned to their native countries. Of these the one to Ruben DeMoura Rezende was returned unopened and seven others have not to this date replied to their letters. The three who did reply all expressed appreciation for the courtesy membership being offered to them. The following are brief quotations from the responses received:

"I not only accept gladly the offer of membership for two years, but also anxious to continue my association with ACLA for my life. Though I had few opportunities to contact the top ranked leaders of ACLA while I was in your great country, I have formed a very high opinion and a good impression about the activities and working of ACLA after studying the various booklets and literature connected with the Association and I really congratulate the promoters and the workers of the ACLA. I am really anxious to learn more about it and I am trying my best to adapt some of your ideals in my service in the villages of our country."

Cheruvathoor T. Ittyachan
Kadavallur, P.O.
(Via) Pazhauji, Trichur, D.T.
Kerala, State, India

"Thank you very much for your letter on November 28, 1962. Few years ago when I went to your country I had relative membership in the American Country Life Association.

"Since that time you send to me many proceedings and materials. These materials and many other subjects gave to me a great deal effectiveness on my task.

"Now, my task is concerning agricultural economics of Hokkaido, for example, agricultural monetary, agricultural corporation, food policy and agricultural insurance.

"So many kind of your materials and proceedings are giving good influence to my task."

Kenichi Nemori
Agricultural Economics Section
Kokkaido Prefectural Government
Sapporo, Japan

"Many thanks for your letter of November 28, 1962, offering me the extension of my membership in the American Country Life Association for an additional two years without cost. As I like very much to continue my fellowship wth the members of the Association, I gladly accept your offer with sincere thanks."

Tai-kooh, Shen, Deputy Director
Taiwan Fisheries Bureau
1688 Chung Shan Road
Taipei, Taiwan, Formosa

The secretary-treasurer of the Association should now write to these three individuals, assuring them of the courtesy extension in their membership and sending them the appropriate materials and other information.

Also a copy of this report should be sent to the person who is presently in charge of AID, together with assurance of the desire of the American Country Life Association to continue to cooperate with them. Although a modest program from our point of view, we believe it to be a valuable one.

Submitted by:
A. F. Wileden
Professor of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin
Liaison Representative for ACLA

Exhibit C

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
THE PRESIDENTIAL COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

A committee consisting of: Prof. Roy C. Buck, Pennsylvania State University; Lois M. Clark, Naitonal Education Association; Paul C. Johnson, Editor of Prairie Farmer; Pastor E. W. Mueller, National Lutheran Council; Msgr. Edward W. O'Rourke, National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Rev. Robert T. Frerichs, Dean of the Baptist Rural Church Center and President of the ACLA; and Milo K. Swanton, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Co-operative, was appointed in keeping with action taken at the 1962 annual meeting.

A majority of the committee met in Chicago on November 26, 1962, at which time it was agreed that a new statement outlining the proposal for a second Presidential Country Life Commission should be developed. It was agreed to recommend:

— A bi-partisan approach;

— Avoid specific details;

— Duration of the Commission should be limited;

— No public hearings;

— Authorization by the Congress and appointment of Commission members by the President;

— The Commission should function as a high-level research agency concerned with country communities and urban trends affecting rural life.

In conformance with committee recommendations a restatement of purposes was drafted which stressed need:

— To estimate future requirements of land and human resources;

— To investigate proper use of land and water resources;

— To evaluate changes in town and country communities;

— To study new functions of village neighborhoods;

— To clarify objectives of changing rural life;

— To avoid loss of rural life values.

This proposal has been favorably received by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the President's office and by many members of Congress. The Family Farm subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee has been holding hearings on the general concept of establishing a Country Life Commission, at which ACLA President Frerichs and ACLA Committee Chairman Swanton presented the position of the ACLA in support of the general proposal. No specific legislation was before the committee at that time.

At the hearing on June 4, in response to questions and comments by Congressmen, ACLA spokesmen pointed out:

— That the Rural Areas Development program does not accomplish fact-finding research;

— That ways to preserve and expand rural social values have not been achieved;

— That suburbanization impinges primarily on rural areas;

— That changing emphases of agricultural extension need exploration;

— That the role of vocational agriculture is being questioned;

— That rural to urban migrants need help in making adjustments;

— That newly developing and expanding recreational patterns greatly affect rural communities;

— That as the number of farm units decline, so the importance of those remaining is enhanced;

— That future trends must be anticipated and studied.

As of July 10, 1963, no bills have been introduced in the House. Senator Hartke of Indiana has been joined by 13 other Democrats and one Republican in sponsoring Senate Bill 1697. Except for authorization to conduct public hearings, this bill is in general accord with the ACLA recommendations. No hearings on this specific Senate Bill 1697 have yet been scheduled.

Submitted by:
Milo K. Swanton, Chairman
ACLA Committee

Exhibit D

A resolution proposed by the

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC.

in annual meeting assembled

at Raleigh, North Carolina

July 10, 1963

American rural and community life is undergoing vast and rapid changes, bringing new problems and causing much bewilderment and uncertainty about the future, among leaders in education, government, religion, farm and civic organizations. There is growing awareness that land resources should be utilized increasingly for purposes in addition to agriculture. There is great need for evaluation and co-ordination of social and economic research already done and studies presently under way.

It is important to investigate the many changing and puzzling facets of our community life so as to bring our needs and our goals into clearer focus. We of the American Country Life Association, Inc., recognize that the United States is becoming increasingly urban and that any study of land and human resources must place emphasis on such changes in our national structure.

Because of this accelerating and significant transition affecting all people, their communities and their nation, the American Country Life Association, Inc., strongly urges the present session of Congress to enact legislation establishing, on a bi-partisan basis, a Presidential Country Life Commission for a period of two or three years.

We sincerely believe such a commission could identify problems growing out of social and technological changes in country communities, coordinate information already available, clarify present trends, consider future developments and carry out high level research helpful to governmental functions to rural life related agencies and to the rank and file of all citizens.

MINUTES — BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors of the American Country Life Association, Inc., met on November 26, 1962, Farm Foundation office, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The meeting was called to order by Rev. Robert T. Frerichs, president.

Present were: Rev. R. T. Frerichs, Dr. W. J. Tudor, Rev. E. W. Mueller, Mr. P. F. Aylesworth, Mrs. Kendall Bryan, Mr. Harry L. Bryson, Miss Lois M. Clark, Rev. Hugh P. Cassidy, Mr. Claude St. DePaer for Roger Fleming, Mr. Glenn S. Fox, Dr. Paul S. Johnson, Mr. Maurice W. Soults, Mr. J. Kenneth Stern, Mr. Milo K. Swanton, Dr. A. F. Wileden, Mr. Edgar W. Wolfe.

Absent were: Dr. Joseph Ackerman, Dr. E. W. Aiton, Dr. J. Carroll Bottum, Dr. Roy C. Buck, Dr. Arthur Floyd, Sr., Mr. Aubrey D. Gates, Rev. Serge Hummon, Miss Gertrude Humphreys, Mr. Jack Jackson.

IT WAS VOTED to accept as mailed the minutes of the last meeting.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the Treasurer's report as presented.

IT WAS VOTED to ask Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Gates, and Mr. Johnson to check the Treasurer's books.

Membership in the Association

IT WAS VOTED that the following statement on membership be accepted and that it be made a part of the constitution and that it be incorporated into the revised statement of ACLA objectives that are to be printed in the form of a flyer:

Membership in the Association is of three kinds:

Individual	$ 5.00
Institutional or organizational —	
Local and County	5.00
State, Regional, National groups	25.00
Sustaining	Unlimited

Proceedings

The Secretary reported on the progress of the printing of the 1961 and 1962 proceedings. There has been a delay because of a lack of funds and unforeseen delays. However, money is now available and they should be off the press early in 1963.

There was discussion which emphasized the desirability that

1) the proceedings be available to all land-grant universities and seminaries,

2) we feature the proceedings in the new flyer,

3) the flyer be sent, together with a letter, telling libraries of the proceedings,

4) we call attention to the proceedings in a similar way by writing to Extension directors, deans of land-grant universities, and rural sociologists,

5) a copy of the proceedings be sent to the editor of **Rural Sociology** magazine, suggesting that it be reviewed in their Book Review section.

The Secretary stated that advance orders had been received for copies of the 1962 proceedings.

President Frerichs stated that he had attended three meetings in the interest of ACLA since July — with Program Committee and concerning Commission on Country Life.

Program Committee

Mr. Tudor, chairman, reported on the program planning done by his Committee. The theme of the conference is to center around the Disadvantaged in Country Life. After much discussion these suggestions were made:

The theme is to center around the people who for some reason or other do not adequately share or participate in the affluency of the American society — our concern for the disadvantaged. The following aspects were mentioned:

1) A theme that has a positive and constructive emphasis.
2) Better use of human resources.
3) Could the theme be stated in form of a question.
4) Opportunities for the disadvantaged.
5) Be sensitive to the different disadvantaged groups without necessarily mentioning them by name. Groups mentioned were:
   - . . . ethnic or racial groups
   - . . . income groups
   - . . . age groups related to agriculture
   - . . . intellectually disadvantaged
6) Involve voluntary organizations who are working with the disadvantaged, along with RAD.
7) Credit should be discussed.

July 9

8:30 A.M. — Registration.
9:00 A.M. — Plans for the conference.
9:30 A.M. — Presidential address.
10:30 A.M. — **Who and Where** (are the disadvantaged) — **J. H. Southern,** USDA Economic Research
— Discussion
1:15 P.M. — Types of Disadvantaged: American Indian
Appalachian White
Spanish American
Migrant
Negro
3:30 P.M. — **Why** (are certain groups disadvantaged) — **Ed Bishop,** North Carolina State
— Discussion
6:30 P.M. — Banquet — **Henry Wallace.**

July 10

8:30 A.M. — Business meeting.
9:15 A.M. — **What** (of the future of the disadvantaged) — **John Baker,** Asst. Sec. of Agriculture
— Discussion
10:45 A.M. — Panel: Rural Areas Development
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Private groups: Fay Bennett's group —
NCCCA—Conf. on Persistent Poverty.
Council of Southern Mts.
1:15 P.M. — Institutions or Agencies that have responsibility —
Public Schools
Church
Higher Education
Youth Groups
2:15 P.M. — **Where to — Roy C. Buck**, Pennsylvania State University.
— Discussion
3:15 P.M. — Closing

Mr. Tudor further reported that Mr. Aylesworth had contacted Mr. Southern and that Dr. Mueller had contacted Dr. Buck about papers. Mr. Johnson was asked to contact Dr. Henry Wallace relative to being the banquet speaker.

It was reported that an invitation had been received from North Carolina State College to hold the 1963 conference on its campus.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the invitation from the North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

IT WAS VOTED that the conference be held July 9-10, 1963.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that the Program Committee prepare a sticker, giving the theme, date, and place of the 1963 conference. These stickers could be sent to the Board members for use in publicizing the meeting.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that:

1) we publicize the meeting vigorously in the Raleigh area,
2) we set up a local promotional committee,
3) we inform the Grange, State Co-op Councils, Extension Service, ASC, FHA, Ag Colleges, in the area,
4) we remind Board members to send the printed program to people whom they know in the area and who would be interested.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the report of the Program Committee.

Agency for International Development

Mr. Wileden explained what the AID program is and that he had corresponded with the office in Washington, expressing ACLA's willingness to cooperate in the program, but that there had been no further indication from AID. The Board encouraged Mr. Wileden to re-establish contact with the directors of AID. He was further encouraged to write to former foreign national members, extending to them a complimentary membership in ACLA for a period of two years. If as a result of this contact they show an interest they are to receive the proceedings without cost.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the AID report.

Commission on Country Life

In keeping with the action taken at the annual meeting of the ACLA, Mr. Swanton, chairman, reported that the Committee is preparing to call for legislation which would create a Commission on Country Life. Mr. Swanton's report emphasized that:

1) We keep it bi-partisan.
2) We avoid being too specific in our demands —
   a. there should be at least 15 commissioners but no more than 25,
   b. if Congressmen are included on the Commission they should not be members because they are members of Congress but because they have a particular competence. The same thing should be true of leaders from various farm organizations.
3) The life of the Commission should be limited — perhaps to two years. At least the Commission should be disbanded a few months after reporting.
4) If hearings are held they should not take on the character of an investigation but the character of an exploratory meeting to gain insights and understanding, to identify problems, and to discover solutions. The entire Commission should be a fact finding Commission.
5) The Commission should have legislative sanction — if a bill should be introduced that calls for legislation that the President appoint such

a Commission. Appointments should be so made that we will have the different walks of life and the different disciplines represented on the Commission. Persons should be appointed not because they represent a certain group or organization but because they are knowledgeable in their area.

6) The objectives and purposes of such a Commission should be —
   a. in line with the objectives defined,
   b. in keeping with the general objectives of ACLA.
7) We should avoid giving it a definite name at this time, but it should include more than the country. It should include the entire town and country community — business service centers. It should also bring into focus the interdependence that exists between rural and urban.
8) We introduce such legislation soon after Congress convenes in January.

In connection with the report the following suggestions were made:

1) That we make sure the Administration knows about the bill.
2) That a paragraph be included which spells out quite clearly the type of persons we would like to see serve on the Commission.
3) That we communicate with other organizations interested in a Commission, informing them that ACLA is introducing legislation calling for a Commission on Country Life.
4) That the body of facts brought together by the Commission could serve as preparation for the White House Conference in 1970.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the report of the Committee on a Commission on Country Life.

Committee on Finances

Mr. Fox reported that the Committee had selected from a book on foundations the names of such foundations whose objectives were similar to ACLA. The Committe will follow up on these, learning more about the interests, etc.

Mr. Fox requested that if Board members knew of individuals associated with a foundation that have an interest in the objectives of ACLA that they offer to serve the Committee by making contact with these people.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that the Committee seek to secure a grant to print the proceedings, rather than a grant to support the ACLA.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the report of the Committee on Finance.

Here the Secretary reported as a matter of information on membership income and contributions since 1951. (See Exhibit A)

Citation Committee

In this connection the suggestion was made that ACLA seek to give two citations, one to a person living in the general area of Raleigh and the other to a person who moves in national circles.

The President appointed the following committees:

Literature Screening Committee: Rev. Serge Hummon, Dr. Paul C. Johnson, Dr. E. W. Mueller.

Nominating Committee: Mr. Glenn Fox, chairman, Mr. P. F. Aylesworth.

Membership Committee: Executive Committee to function here.

The next Board of Directors meeting was set for July 9, 7:30 P.M., North Carolina State College, and to be continued as needed.

IT WAS VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted:
E. W. Mueller, Secretary

Exhibit A

AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Membership Totals Since 1951 — With Contribution Listed

1951

159 @ $3 ind. 2 @ $5 ind. 4 @ $5 inst. 1 @ $10 inst. 11 @ $25 org.
4 @ $10 affl. $300 — Farm Foundation $100 — M. K. Swanton

1952

11 @ $3 ind. 95 @ $5 ind. 9 @ $25 org.
$1000 — Sears Roebuck Foundation $85 — M. K. Swanton
$50 — Dane Co., Wisconsin Co-op

1953

104 @ $5 ind. 7 @ $25 org. $1000 — Sears Roebuck Foundation

1954

32 @ $5 ind. 1 @ $25 org. $1000 — Sears Roebuck Foundation
$50 — W. Pretzer

1955

4 @ $5 ind.

1956

14 @ $5 ind. 1 @ $25 org. $1500 — Sears Roebuck Foundation

1957

63 @ $5 ind. 9 @ $25 org. $1500 — Sears Roebuck Foundation

1958

125 @ $2 ind. 12 @ $25 org. $1500 — Sears Roebuck Foundation
$100 — Consumers Co-operative Assn.

1959

146 @ $2 ind. 13 @ $25 org.

1960

145 @ $2 ind. 3 @ $5 co. 14 @ $25 org.
$8 — L. M. Clark

1961

113 @ $5 ind. 4 @ $2 ind. 13 @ $25 org. 2 @ $5 co.
$1500 — Sears Roebuck Foundation

1962

105 @ $5 ind. 14 @ $25 org.

MINUTES — BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors of the American Country Life Association, Inc., met on July 8 and 9, 1963, College Union, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina. The meeting was called to order by Rev. Robert T. Frerichs, President.

Present were: Dr. Roy C. Buck, Miss Lois M. Clark, Rev. Hugh P. Cassidy, Mr. Glenn S. Fox, Rev. R. T. Frerichs, Miss Gertrude Humphreys, Rev. E. W. Mueller, Mr. J. Kenneth Stern, Mr. Milo K. Swanton, Dr. W. J. Tudor, Dr. A. F. Wileden, Mr. Edgar W. Wolfe.

Unable to attend were: Dr. Joseph Ackerman, Dr. E. W. Aiton, Dr. P. F. Aylesworth, Dr. J. C. Bottum, Mrs. Kendall Bryan, Mr. H. L. Bryson, Mr. Roger Fleming, Dr. Arthur Floyd, Sr., Mr. Aubrey Gates, Rev. Serge Hummon, Mr. Jack Jackson, Dr. Paul C. Johnson, Mr. M. W. Soults.

President Frerichs introduced to the Board members Dr. Selz Mayo, Department of Rural Sociology, North Carolina State College, who welcomed the Association to the campus and reported on the activities of the local planning committee. Local plans were carried out, in addition to Dr. Mayo, by Dr. James Young and Mr. T. N. Hobgood, Jr.

President Frerichs asked Secretary Mueller to read the minutes of the November 26, 1962, meeting.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the minutes as read.

The President asked for a report from the Treasurer.

IT WAS VOTED to accept the Treasurer's report as prepared for the annual meeting. (See Exhibit A, Annual Meeting Minutes.)

The Secretary reported that the proceedings for 1961 and for 1962 had been prepared, printed, and mailed since the last Board meeting. He emphasized that the preparation of the proceedings is a large assignment, which is largely carried out by Miss Herrboldt. (This she does on her own time.) He presented a report on printing, distribution, income, etc. of past proceedings. (See attached exhibit.)

The Secretary stated that the revised flyer had been printed and used in mailings, that the constitution was printed in the proceedings but that the articles of incorporation were not included.

The Secretary reported that since a copy of the Articles of Incorporation could not be found in the files, he corresponded with the Department of State, State of New York, where the Association had been incorporated, asking for a copy of the Articles of Incorporation. We were informed that the corporation was dissolved by proclamation of the Secretary of State, published on October 15, 1952, pursuant to Section 57 of the Membership Corporation Law, and that if we were interested in filing a certificate of annulment of dissolution and reinstatement of the corporation, we needed to fill in the blank they enclosed and return it to the Secretary of State, together with a certified check for $5.00.

The Secretary presented this matter for discussion.

Specific mailings done by the Secretary's office included proceedings mailed and orders taken care of; letters sent to about 400 libraries, telling them about the ACLA and the proceedings available; invitations to the annual conference sent to about 1000 persons; and a limited amount of general correspondence on inquiries; as well as membership promotion and items related to it.

The Secretary reported that the membership as of June 30, 1963, included 105 individuals and 17 organizations. Four of these members are foreign nationals.

The Secretary's report was accepted with appreciation.

The ACLA incorporation status was discussed.

IT WAS VOTED that the Association reincorporate in the State of New York; that Mr. J. Kenneth Stern confer with an attorney as to procedure.

The President reported that he had represented the ACLA through personal appearances and through correspondence. He appeared with Mr. Milo Swanton before the House Committee on Agriculture in the interest of a Presidential Commission on Country Life.

Program Committee: Dr. W. J. Tudor, chairman, shared the program with the Board members and filled in names of panel members who were missing from the printed program.

Commission on Country Life: Mr. Milo K. Swanton, chairman, presented a report on the activities of his committee. See Exhibit C, Annual Meeting Minutes.

IT WAS VOTED that the Committtee on a Commission on Country Life draft a resolution to be submitted to the annual meeting, supporting the efforts of Senators on Senate Bill 1697, calling for a presidential commission on country life.

AID Liaison: Dr. A. F. Wiileden reported on our relationship with the Agency for International Development. See Exhibit B, Annual Meeting Minutes.

Citation Committee: Chairman Roy Buck reported that Mr. Alan B. Kline, retired, former president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. Robert Mullen, executive secretary, Sears Roebuck Foundation, had been nominated for the citation and that both gentlemen would be at the banquet to receive the citations.

All committee reports were accepted with appreciation.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that we explore the various aspects of recreation and that we think in terms of planning a program for two years. The first year should be a general presentation of recreational needs from the standpoint of resource development and personal growth. The second year should deal with recreation in depth.

A suggested wording of the theme was: Recreation for Economic and Personal Growth in Country Living.

IT WAS SUGGESTED that the titles of papers be substantive in nature.

Dr. Buck suggested that the ACLA might include in its area of concern the interests of people who are involved in mining, fishing, and the oil industry, to give the Association a broader interest base.

The Nominating Committee, Mr. Glenn S. Fox, chairman, recommended the following for 1963-1964 officers: Rev. Robert T. Frerichs, president; Dr. W. J. Tudor, vice president; Rev. E. W. Mueller, secretary-treasurer.

IT WAS VOTED to elect the recommended slate of officers for a term of one year.

President Frerichs appointed the following committees:

Executive Committee: Rev. Hugh P. Cassidy, Mr. Aubrey Gates, Dr. Paul C. Johnson, Mr. Milo K. Swanton, and the officers.

Membership Committee: Executive Committee to function here.

Program Committee: Dr. W. J. Tudor, chairman, Dr. P. F. Aylesworth, Miss Lois M. Clark, Rev. Serge Hummon, Dr. E. W. Mueller, Mr. J. Kenneth Stern, Rev. R. T. Frerichs, ex-officio.

Commission on Country Life: Mr. Milo K. Swanton, chairman, Dr. Roy C. Buck, Miss Lois M. Clark, Dr. Paul C. Johnson, Dr. E. W. Mueller, Rev. E. W. O'Rourke, Rev. R. T. Frerichs.

Nominating Committee: Dr. E. W. Aiton, chairman, Mr. Edgar Wolfe.

AID Liaison: Dr. A. F. Wileden.

Citation Committee: Miss Gertrude Humphreys, chairman, Dr. P. F. Aylesworth, Mr. J. Kenneth Stern.

Finance Committee: Mr. Glenn S. Fox, chairman, Mrs. Kendall Bryan, Mr. Harry L. Bryson, Dr. R. J. Hildreth.

Literature Committee: Dr. R. J. Hildreth, Dr. E. W. Mueller, Mr. Jerry Voorhis.

The next conference date was set for July 7 and 8, 1964, National 4-H Club Center, Washington, D.C., with a Board of Directors meeting scheduled for the evening of July 6, 1964.

The next Board of Directors meeting was suggested for December 2, 1963, in Chicago, Illinois. The President and the Secretary are to make the final decision after polling the Board members.

It was suggested that a possible meeting place for the 1965 annual conference might be the Thor Center, Huntley, Illinois.

IT WAS VOTED to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted:
E. W. Mueller, Secretary

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS

Mailed a letter to 395 libraries, telling them about available proceedings. This included all land-grant university libraries, some church college and seminary libraries, and other college and university libraries picked at random from the listing in the dictionary.

We have 45 standing orders on file. Most of them are land-grant university libraries.

Year	No. Printed	Cost of Printing	Income from Sales
1956	450	$ 500.00	$122.92 (1/57 to 12/57)
1957	450	550.00	126.61 (1/58 to 12/58)
1958	1,000	1,052.00	127.72 (1/59 to 12/59)
1959	1,000	824.00	154.22 (1/60 to 12/60)
1960	700	641.12	230.42 (1/61 to 12/61)
1961	1,000	716.95	74.08 (1/62 to 12/62)
1962	1,000	1,059.98	428.60* (1/63 to 7/63)

(*Plus $775.67 for reprints on individual papers of 1962 conference.)

Inventory of Proceeding, 6/30/63:

No. on Hand	Year	Title
1	1919	Rural Health
5	1922	Country Community Education
2	1933	National Policies Affecting Rural Life
4	1935	Country Life Programs
6	1939	What's Ahead for Rural America
100	1943	American Rural Life in Wartime
125	1944	Farm and Rural Life in a Changing World
2	1950	The Years Ahead in Rural Living
16	1951	Home & Community Responsibilities in a World of Tension
85	1952	The Farm Family: Its Contribution and Its Problems
127	1953	Getting Action to Meet Community Needs
20	1954	An Appraisal of Our Changing Rural Communities
24	1955	New Aims in Rural Life
18	1956	Rural Families with Low Income
109	1958	Mobilizing Forces for Dynamic Action in Rural Life
235	1959	Making the Most of Human Resources Through Rural Community Development
21	1960	Rural Life in '65
475	1961	Continuing Education and Country Life
410	1962	Our Town & Country Society Looks at Itself

MEMBERSHIP — 1963

Individual —

Ackerman, Dr. Joseph — Managing Dir., Farm Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
Aiton, Dr. E. W. — Dir. of Extension, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Albrecht, Mr. Richard — Editor, Wallace Farmer, Des Moines, Ia.
Amundsen, The Rev. Wesley—ASI Secy., Seventh-Day Adventist, Washington, D.C.
Anthony, The Rev. Wm. S. — Episcopal Church, Dabney House, Java, Va.
Aylesworth, Dr. P. F. — Federal Extension Service, USDA, Washington, D.C.
Babington, Mr. S. E. — Pres., Brookhaven Bank & Trust Co., Brookhaven, Miss.
Bertrand, Dr. A. L. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Mississippi State Univ., Baton Rouge, La.
Boardman, Mr. Walter S.—Exec. Dir., The Nature Conservancy, Washington, D.C.
Bonser, Dr. Howard J. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa.
Bose, Mr. Anil Numar — Joint Secy., Young Farmer's Assoc., Calcutta, India
Bottum, Dr. J. Carroll — Asst. Head, Agric. Economics, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind.
Bryan, Mrs. Kendall — National Staff, Girl Scouts of USA, New York, N.Y.
Bryson, Mr. Harry L. — Exec. Vice Pres., Agricultural Hall of Fame, Kansas City, Mo.
Buck, Dr. Roy C. — Assoc. Dir., Social Sciences, Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa.
Campbell, Miss Nancy — National Field Staff, Girl Scouts of USA, Atlanta, Ga.
Carr, The Rev. James M. — Secy. Church in Town & Country, Presbyterian Church, U.S., Atlanta, Ga.
Case, Dr. H. C. M. — Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Cassidy, The Rev. Hugh P.—National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Franklin, Ill.
Choudhery, Mr. Shri Ram Singh — Jaipur, India
Christenson, Mr. Arthur T. — Dir. of Parish Conservation, The American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn.
Claar, Dr. J. B. — Assoc. Dir. of Extension, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Clark, Miss Lois M. — Asst. Secy., Dept. of Rural Education, National Education Assoc., Washington, D.C.
Cook, Col. H. Wallace, Sr. — Area 5 Crops Mgr., Eastern States Farmers' Exchange, Elkton, Md.
Cooper, Mr. William C. — Asst. State 4-H Club Leader, A & T College of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C.
Cowden, Mrs. Howard A. — Housewife, Kansas City, Mo.
Dolan, Mr. Robert M. — Org. Dir., Credit Union National Assoc., Madison, Wis.
Downey, Mr. Mylo S. — Dir. 4-H & Youth Development, USDA, Washington, D.C.
Dreyer, Mr. Stanley — Asst. Exec. Dir., Cooperative League, USA, Chicago, Ill.
Ekola, The Rev. Giles — Asst. Secy., Church in Town & Country, National Lutheran Council, Chicago, Ill.
Floyd, Dr. Arthur, Sr.—Supervisor, Vocational Education, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.
Fox, Mr. Glenn S. — Asst. Gen. Mgr., Farmers Union Cooperative Marketing

Assoc., Kansas City, Mo.

Franseth, Miss Jane — U.S. Office of Education, HEW, Washington, D.C.

Frerichs, The Rev. R. T. — Dean, Rural Church Center, American Baptist Convention, Green Lake, Wis.

Frye, The Rev. G. Shubert — Assoc. Dir., Bd. of Nat'l. Missions, United Presbyterian Church USA, New York, N.Y.

Gates, Mr. Aubrey D. — Div. of Field Services, American Medical Assoc., Chicago, Ill.

Gilliland, Mr. C. B. — Deputy Dir., Office of Rural Areas Development, USDA, Washington, D.C.

Golby, Mr. James L. — Principal, Kewanee High School, Kewanee, Ill.

Green, Mr. Jesus Gonzales — Sevilla, Spain

Guard, Mr. Samuel R. — Editor, Breeder's Gazette, Louisville, Ky.

Hays, Mrs. Earl — Home Demonst. Council, Falling Waters, W. Va.

Herrboldt, Miss Irma — Secy., Chicago, Ill.

Hildreth, Dr. R. J. — Assoc. Managing Dir., Farm Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Hobson, Mrs. Jane — Vt. Free Public Library Service, Montpelier, Vt.

Hoiberg, Dr. Otto G. — Head, Hall of Youth, Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.

Humphreys, Miss Gertrude — State Ext. Home Demonst. Leader, West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, W. Va.

Jehlik, Dr. Paul J. — Co-op. State Experiment Station Serv., USDA, Washington, D.C.

Johnson, Dr. Paul C. — Editor, Prairie Farmer, Chicago, Ill.

Jones, Mr. R. E. — State Agent in Charge of Negro Work, A & T College, Greensboro, N.C.

Kaitschuk, Rev. A. H. — Lutheran Church in America, Campbell Hill, Ill.

Kaufman, Dr. Harold F. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Mississippi State Univ., State College, Miss.

Kee, Miss S. Janice — Secy., Wisc. Free Library Comm., Madison, Wis.

Keener, Dr. Orrin L. — Prof. Social Studies, Berea College, Berea, Ky.

King, Dr. Rufus B.—Rural Life Association, Manchester College, Manchester, Ind.

Kleckner, Mr. Clarence W. — Insurance & Tax Service, Rockford, Ill.

Knutson, Mrs. K. D. — Farm Partner, Janesville, Wis.

Knutson, Mr. K. D. — Farmer, Janesville, Wis.

Lebold, The Rev. Keene R. — Merom Institute, Merom, Ind.

Lindstrom, Dr. D. E. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Locke, Dr. Frank M. — Prof., Trinity Univ., Waco, Tex.

Logan, The Rev. Calvin — United Presbyterian Church USA, Waukesha, Wis.

Lutz, The Rev. Wm. B. — Methodist Church, Mayville, Mich.

McCanna, The Rev. Dr. Henry A. — Exec. Secy., Dept. of Church in Town & Country, National Council of Churches, New York, N.Y.

McComb, Capt. Allan W. — Retired, State Grange Master, Maryville, Tenn.

Magruder, Mr. John W. — Retired, Co-op. Ext., College Park, Md.

Manny, Mrs. Elsie S. — Social Scientist, USDA, Washington, D.C.

Matthew, The Rev. John C. — United Presbyterian Church USA, New York, N.Y.

Maurer, Dr. B. B. — Secy., Parish Development, Lutheran Church in America, Chicago, Ill.

Mayberry, Dr. B. D. — Dean, School of Agriculture, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.
Miller, Dr. Paul A. — Pres., West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, W. Va.
Miller, Dr. Roy D. — Prof., United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio
Moomaw, Dr. I. W. — Agricultural Missions, Inc., Madison, N.J.
Morrison, Dr. R. D. — Pres., Alabama A & M College, Normal, Ala.
Mosher, Dr. M. L. — Retired, Agric. Ext., Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Mueller, The Rev. Dr. E. W. — Secy., Church in Town & Country, National Lutheran Council, Chicago, Ill.
Murray, The Rev. Christopher — Roman Catholic, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.
Nelson, Miss Emmie — Field Rep., National 4-H Service Committee, Inc., Chicago, Ill.
Niederfrank, Dr. E. J. — Rural Sociologist, USDA, Washington, D.C.
Patton, Dr. Betty Jean — Bd. of National Missions, United Presbyterian Church USA, New York, N.Y.
Paul, Mr. D. K. — Principal, G.S. Training Centre, West Bengal, India
Pepper, The Rev. Clayton — American Baptist Convention, Granville, Ohio
Puhr, Miss Marie — Farm Credit Adminis., USDA, Washington, D.C.
Quadland, Mr. H. P. — The H. P. Quadland Co., New York, N.Y.
Rhoades, Dr. J. Benton — Exec. Dir., Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Robinson, Dr. Wm. McKinley — Prof., Western Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Rossiter, Mr. V. E., Sr. — Pres., Bank of Hartington, Hartington, Nebr.
Ryter, Mr. Rene — Rural Church Consultant, Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Samuelson, The Rev. C. L. — Church in Town & Country, Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, N.Y.
Schneider, Mr. E. F. — Vice Pres., International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.
Schroeder, The Rev. Dr. Martin — Lutheran Church in America, Lincoln, Nebr.
Schweitzer, Dr. H. J. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Sheppard, Mr. F. W., Jr. — Agric. Ext. Specialist, Texas A & M College, College Station, Tex.
Smith, Dr. Mervin G. — Chrm., Dept. of Agric. Econ. & Rural Soc., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio
Soults, Mr. M. W. — Asst. Dir. of Extension, Iowa State Univ., Ames, Ia.
Southwell, Mr. Garth A. — Grenada, West Indies
Stacy, Dr. W. H. — Ext. Sociologist, Iowa State Univ., Ames, Ia.
Stelling, The Rev. W. J. — Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod), Freistatt, Mo.
Stern, Mr. J. Kenneth—Pres., American Institute of Cooperation, Washington, D.C.
Stewart, Mr. M. C. — Farmer, Homer City, Pa.
Swanton, Mr. Milo K. — Exec. Secy., Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Co-Op., Madison, Wis.
Taylor, Dr. Calvin C. — Agric. Economist, Forest Service, USDA, Asheville, N.C.
Taylor, Dr. Carl C. — Consultant, Ford Foundation, Arlington, Va.
Trelogan, Dr. Harry C. — Adminis., Statistical Reporting Serv., USDA, Washington, D.C.
Tudor, Dr. W. J. — Community Services Div., Southern Ill. Univ., Carbondale, Ill.
Turner, Mrs. Helen D. — Home Economist, USDA, Washington, D.C.

Vizzard, The Rev. James L., S.J. — National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Washington, D.C.

Warren, Miss Gertrude — Retired, National 4-H Leader, Washington, D.C.

Washburn, Dr. W. Wyan — Coun. on Rural Health, American Medical Assoc., Boiling Springs, N.C.

Watson, Mr. Jake — Assessor-Collector, Beckville Independent School Dist., Beckville, Tex.

Wieting, Dr. C. Maurice — Vice Pres., Dir. of Info., Ohio Farm Bureau, Columbus, Ohio

Wilcox, Dr. R. W. — Ext. Economist, Univ. of Idaho, Boise, Ida.

Wileden, Dr. A. F. — Prof. Rural Sociology, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Wolters, The Rev. Gilbert, O.S.B. — Head of Sociology Dept., St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan.

Wyum, Mr. Obed A. — Farmer, Rutland, N.D.

Yohe, Mr. Ralph S. — Editor, Wisconsin Agriculturist, Racine, Wis.

Organizational —

American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.
Council on Rural Health, American Medical Assoc., Chicago, Ill.
Boy Scouts of America, Rural Relationships Service, New Brunswick, N.J.
Cooperative League of the USA, Chicago, Ill.
Farm Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
Farmers Union Cooperative Marketing Association, Kansas City, Mo.
Grocery Manufacturers of America, New York, N.Y.
Division of National Missions, Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.
National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, Batchelor, La.
National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Ia.
Division of Domestic Mission, National Council, Episcopal Church, New York, N.Y.
Dept. of Rural Education, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
The National Grange, Washington, D.C.
Church in Town and Country, National Lutheran Council, Chicago, Ill.
Southern States Cooperative, Inc., Richmond, Va.
Church in Town and Country, United Church of Christ, St. Louis, Mo.
Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Co-op., Madison, Wis.
Sears Roebuck Foundation, Chicago, Ill.